35

BRAHMAVIDYA

ANNIE BESANT

3·5



BRAHMAVIDYA

(DIVINE WISDOM)

THE BRAHMAVIDYA LIBRARY, No. 1

BRAHMAVIDYA

(DIVINE WISDOM)

BY

ANNIE BESANT, D.L., P.T.S.

BEING THE SIX
INAUGURAL LECTURES
. . . OF THE . . .
BRAHMAVIDYASHRAMA,
ADYAR, OCTOBER, 1922

WITH A PREFACE

BY

S. SUBRAMANIA IYER, LL.D.

(Second Edition)

THEOSOPHICAL PUBLISHING HOUSE
ADYAR, MADRAS, INDIA
1927

First Edition, 1923.

PREFACE

The Registrar of the Brahmavidyāshrama, my good friend Dr. Cousins, has been pleased to ask me to write a preface to these six lectures delivered by the President of the Āshrama, Dr. Annie Besant, its founder, during the week in which the work of the Āshrama auspiciously began. My first inclination was against complying with the request, for the simple reason that for me to pose as competent to introduce to the general public, with any words of mine, these brilliant discourses of my beloved Teacher would be a manifest presumption. But my disinclination has been overcome by the fact that my compliance with the Registrar's request would afford me an opportunity of giving expression to my great gratification at the manner in which he and the lecturers of the Āshrama have co-operated with the President-Founder, Dr. Annie Besant, in bringing into existence this all-comprehensive centre of the truest World-Culture.

I have no doubt that, when I ventured in December, 1921, to offer some remarks on the subject of providing in the National University, Adyar, the moral training needed as a preliminary to Yoga,

many friends thought that I was indulging in a dream never to be realised. But I am sure that those sceptical friends now feel surprise and delight at finding the Āshrama an accomplished fact within so short a time, providing not only for the limited training I had in view, but likewise for study and research along the great lines converging towards that consummation of Yoga, Union with the Divine Spirit, the finale of human unfolding.

That such is the wide scope of the work intended to be done in the Āshrama is indicated in the name felicitously chosen for it. No more appropriate and truer title could have been selected for our new-born institution. The Brahmaviḍyā connotes a great deal more than the knowledge of Brahman (Supreme Being) attainable through intellect alone. The term Viḍyā (knowledge) in such a context implies realisation of the Divine State of consciousness, which is the goal of all seekers after Brahman. A great aphorism says: "Brahmaviḍ Brahmaiva Bhavaṭi" ("the knower of Brahman becomes Brahman Itself"); and it is in this sense of *becoming* that the term in question is used in the Upanishaḍs in reference to certain forms of contemplation and worship of Divine Powers handed down by Ṛṣhis of yore.

Next, as to the future of what has been ushered in so silently within the past few months; it is my belief that it is verily the planting of a seed which will grow into a mighty tree of knowledge

and learning, that will be found on the banks of the Adyar river centuries hence, even as has been described by a great Seer; a central University for the promotion of studies along the lines indicated in these lectures, with subsidiary centres in various parts of the world, affiliated to it. I may add that my mind further sees, in this publication of the President's inaugural addresses, the commencement of a beneficent literature which will go forth from this central institution in times to come, when humanity has reached a higher level of consciousness and social organisation, and so gives greater scope for the spread of the ideas contained and indicated in these lectures.

Now turning to the programme to be gone through by the students of the Āshrama, and to the ideals to be kept steadily before their minds; it seems to me that the students will profit greatly—especially those who take up the full two-years' course—not only from the point of view of their inner growth, but also of their usefulness and their value as members of society.

As an essential item of such studies, the conductors of the Āshrama will see that the students thoroughly grasp and assimilate the five vital and profound truths with which every aspirant to Brahmaviḍyā should be familiar from the outset. The first three of these truths make up one distinct set, while the remaining two make up another. The former fall under the category of Paramārtha Saṭya—Truths

which are absolute by reason of their specific relation with Brahman—in Its Spaceless, Timeless and Changeless aspect of Transcendence. The latter set has to be reckoned as Vyavahāra Saṭya—Truths which are relative because of their connection with those Divine Ideations which are working themselves out in Space and Time, and thus involve Change—Samsāra or Evolution.

The gist of the teachings of the Sacred Science on the point under reference may be thus expressed :

1. All verily is Brahman.
2. The source of everything whatsoever is to be found in Brahman's own and very Nature.
3. Everything from the ultimate standpoint is inevitable.
4. Whatever promotes and forwards evolution is *Manṭavya*—thinkable, right.
5. Whatever hinders or retards evolution is *Amanṭavya*—unthinkable, wrong.

A student who leaves the Āshrama saturated with the knowledge and the spirit of the above all-important principles, to speak of nothing else, will be likely to render some service of practical value to the community in which his lot may be cast, particularly in these troublous times so embittered by conflict between race and race, and between class and class. He will know that all who are at present subject to injury and harm at the hands of some of their fellow-men are but reaping what they had sown in the past,

and that their sufferings are but the natural outcome of the law of causation, of perfect Justice, which is none other than Brahman busy at work in manifestation, ever adjusting what would otherwise be unimaginable chaos into the ineffable Cosmos which it is. The student cannot, therefore, help making large allowances for those inflictors of injury on their brethren, for he sees in these evil-doers but the instruments which the Supreme Law finds ready to hand in fulfilling Itself. He will therefore feel that such evil-doers, when their retribution overtakes them in due course, will have to pay heavily for their misdeeds, and that their case calls for pity more than for anger, resentment and retaliation. And therefore such a student, instead of fomenting hatred between oppressor and oppressed, as is now sadly the fashion, bringing both to misery and ruin, will seek to generate good-will within the sphere of his influence however small it be. Futher more, this peacemaker, in trying to remedy the unhappy state of things which he encounters in the scene of his future labours, will endeavour to reform things by means which are *Manṭavya*, sedulously refraining from resorting to the means of the opposite character, *Amanṭavya*, because of their tendency to destroy law and order, to kindle ill-will, which will necessarily find expression in violence, bloodshed and disorder.

If the Āshrama does nothing more than send forth from time to time students who will serve as centres

of light and amity in their neighbourhood, workers on the right lines in the interest of reconstruction, now so urgent throughout the world, the Āshrama, as their Alma Mater, will fairly earn the gratitude of all who are intent upon expediting everywhere the fulfilment of this greatest need of the hour.

With reference to the inaugural lectures in this, the first transaction of the Brahmavidyāshrama; they contain the fruit of observation and study of, and meditation on, almost every aspect of human life and activity, during over half a century, by the most versatile genius still happily among us, who has been all this long time strenuously perfecting herself, her intellect, her emotions, and bringing down that perfection into her everyday life. These discourses are, therefore, rich with substance not merely to be tasted, but chewed and digested, by all who wish to enrich themselves by drawing upon such a rare and highly concentrated store of synthetical wisdom. I am sure that few among those who study the discourses will have to say that they have not learned something original and suggestive with reference to the subjects luminously discussed by the lecturer. Even students who are more or less familiar with the topics dealt with by her will find them often presented from a point of view altogether new and exalted, and always with an eye to human welfare. An apt example of this will be found in the position taken that Knowledge is sacred, and the well-merited

denunciation of the iniquity of prostituting scientific discoveries for sordid and mercenary purposes, and for destruction of life. It were well if the scientific world could realise the lamentable disservice that has been done to the cause of civilisation by the wicked use which has been made of some of these discoveries in recent years. As the lecturer points out, it is the misuse of these discoveries that compels the Powers who guide the destinies of mankind to bar, for the time being, the acquisition by the scientists of the day of the knowledge of forces of nature, the right use of which would enable humanity to make a heaven on earth.

I conclude with the fervent prayer: May the blessings of the Guardians of our afflicted humanity ever rest on this Āshrama, the latest achievement of Their illustrious servant in her ceaseless efforts to carry out Their benign plans for the uplift of that humanity.

S. Subramania Iyer

CONTENTS

MYSTICISM:

OR

GOD MANIFESTING AS WILL

From the unreal lead us to the Real.
From darkness lead us to Light.
From death lead us to Immortality.

THAT, my friends, is the real subject of this opening talk of the Brahmavidyāshrama. You may remember the rousing cry that goes out from the *Kathopanishad*: "Arise! Awake! Seek the Great Teachers, and attend. For the road is hard to travel, verily narrow as the edge of a razor."

Now, what is really meant by the western word, "Mysticism"? It is the "Yoga" of the East. The word Yoga proclaims the Union; the word Mysticism implies more, perhaps, the way to the Union than the fact of the Union itself. What it really means is that the Āṭmā in man (that fragment of Divinity) is seeking consciously to be one with the Universal, "the One without a second". Wherever you find anyone who is trying to walk along the narrow ancient way, he is seeking a path shorter, more strenuous, more arduous, than the ordinary path of

evolution; he is not seeking the unreal, the darkness, and death; he is seeking the Real, the Light, and Immortality. And it is written: "When all the bonds of the heart are broken, then man becomes immortal." In truth, he realises more than his immortality; he realises his Eternity. For it is written in an ancient Hebrew book: "God created man to be immortal, and made him to be an image of His own Eternity." The word "immortal," like "everlasting," belongs, as it were, to time. The word "Eternity" means Self-existence, the realisation that we are part of that who is the One. Mysticism means the seeking for that One; Yoga means the union with that One. Yet both are the Path, and the Path merges into the One. There is a fine definition in one of the Upanishaḍs where it is said that "the One, the only One, without distinctions, emanating from Himself Shakṭi (Power or Powers), creates infinite distinctions. Into Him the universe is dissolved". He is not Īshvara, the Lord of a universe; He is Brahman.

We find this as the goal of all religions, the outer ways of searching after God. But there is one great difference between the Mystic, or Yogī, and the religionist, in the ordinary sense of the word. All the Mystics ultimately agree, while the religions are marked by differences. The path of the Mystic is one and the same, no matter to what outer Faith he may belong, no matter in what outer religion he may

find his starting-point; for the goal is the Unity, the union of the apparently separate fragment with the One from whom it comes, in whom it is ever inseparate. To be a Mystic means to step aside from the ordinary path of evolution, and to climb straight upwards, as it were, to the mountain-peak whereon the Glory of the Lord abides. And so, wherever we find Mystics, they are treading the same path; wherever we find them, they are seeking the same goal; and wherever we find them, they are using the same methods; for the Path is one, and the methods are one, and the Goal is one.

The methods are very fully laid down in the Upanishaḍs of Hinḍūism, and in other writings of the Illuminated Ṛṣhis, the Great Teachers of mankind. They have laid down many details, many conditions, which are necessary for the treading of the Path. And the conditions are hard: it is absolutely useless to try to minimise them, or to cover them over with soft words, or sentimental feelings. The man who would be a Mystic is, as it were, challenging external nature; saying that he will do in a brief space of lives that for which millions of years are allowed to the mass of the children of men. The difficulties cannot be realised till the person begins to tread the Path. Their greatness, their severity, is always under-judged by the aspirant. He is eager to advance, and he does not know the perils of the way that he is challenging; and so, for the warning of aspirants,

these conditions that I have just alluded to are laid down, so that people may realise what it is that they desire to do, the immensity of the effort, and the qualities that are required, before the Goal is reached. Those qualities are the same wherever the Mystic may be found, among the ancient and the modern peoples. They do not change. They are part of that Eternity of which the Mystic is seeking to realise himself as part, and so necessarily they will not change. You may look upon Mysticism, if you will, as evolution crushed into the palm of a hand, and estimate then something of what has to be done by the one who would try to achieve.

In the Sūṭras of Paṭañjali, there are five definite stages which are preparatory to Yoga. Only in the last of them begins the practice of Yoga ; and they are the natural stages through which every human ego develops, through which he must pass before he can even begin to think of becoming a Mystic. The first of them is the childhood of the ego, which Paṭañjali compares to a butterfly, fluttering about from one flower to another, seeking honey everywhere, attracted by the beauty of the blossoms, with nothing stable or steadfast or concentrated about it. Such a one, he says, is not fit for Yoga. The butterfly stage is a natural state. There is no harm in it, no wrong in it, nothing to be ashamed of in it. You do not blame a child because it likes to play, because it runs after a bright toy, because it has developed no

steadfastness of will, no strenuous thinking. But the child is not fit for Yoga.

The next stage Paṭañjali calls the stage of youth, which is confused, carried away by great surges of feeling, enthusiastic for one ideal to-day, for another to-morrow. The emotions blur the thinking faculty, because they colour the mind; because they give rise to prejudices, to bias, so that judgment is not clear and impartial. That youth, says Paṭañjali, is not fit for Yoga.

The next stage is that in which the individual is mature, and is possessed by one dominant idea; one idea has seized hold of him, and drives him, controls him, allows nothing else, as it were, to come in. He will not argue, will not reason, will not consider what we call the pros and cons of the matter, is held in the grip of an idea. There are two sets of people who are held in that way, and the value of each of them depends on the truth or falsehood of the dominant idea. The maniac is held by one dominant idea which is false. You cannot persuade him out of it. He is in a grip that he cannot shake off, and it is based on a false thought. There is the other fixed idea, which makes a hero or a martyr. You cannot reason with them nor argue with them. They throw everything aside. You may plead with them about public opinion, family responsibilities, parental love. They listen to nothing. There is one thing before them alone, and that they pursue at every peril, nay

at every certainty of destruction. Where the fixed idea that dominates is true, then, Paṭañjali says, that man is coming near to Yoga. There are found in him qualities that you can see at once are necessary for great achievement; strength of will above all, which is predominantly required for the Mystic Path.

Then the fourth stage comes, in which the man stands apart from his ideas, and chooses among them which he will follow. In the first three, you have the man living on the three lower planes of life—the physical, astral and lower mental. Now he passes on to the higher plane, the plane of the ego himself; and he knows he is not his thoughts; he knows he is not his emotions; he knows he is not his body; and he stands, sometimes it is said, as a spectator, and out of the many branching roads before him he chooses the one road which to him is the right, the highest. He now possesses the idea; he is not possessed by it. He has chosen it; it has not seized him in its grip. That man, says Paṭañjali, is fit for Yoga.

In the fifth stage he begins the practice of Yoga, conscious that he is ready, by that which he has made of his own nature during those preliminary stages. He is fit for Yoga, and he may begin to practise it.

While Paṭañjali has arranged the stages of development in that way, which is very easy to remember, and very significant, the Upanishaḍs have put the same thing in other ways. Not

in that precise way, which you may call the very Science of Yoga, but rather in hints and suggestions thrown out, which those who are ready for them will gradually assimilate. Looking at these, we find some things which will prevent a man from treading the Mystic Path. For it is written that, not by learning, nor by understanding, nor by many-branched science, can a man reach the Supreme, or find the Āṭmā within him. And it is written that the knowledge of the Āṭmā is not gained by the Vedas, nor by science, nor by understanding, nor by devotion, nor even by knowledge wedded to devotion; but these are the qualities by which man will approach the Supreme.

Then there is traced out the Path on each plane. On the physical plane, temperance in all things, as Shrī Kṛshṇa laid it down, and as the Lord Buḍḍha laid it down—the Middle Path. Not too much sleep, said Shrī Kṛshṇa, nor too little; not too much food, nor too little; not the path of luxury, nor the path of tormenting the body; but that middle path of temperance in which dispassion is gained, in which the pleasant is not repelled when it is present, nor sought for when it is absent. Either is accepted as it comes. Wealth or poverty, palace or cottage—all these things are unreal; and on the physical plane dispassion is needed for success in Yoga.

Then we are taught we must control the emotions; and thirdly we must conquer the restlessness of the

mind; and it is said that when that is achieved, then: "He who is free from desire and without grief beholds in the tranquillity of the senses the majesty of the Self."

Looking at it thus, we begin to realise how much must be done before we actually tread this Path of Yoga, this Path of Mysticism. We must learn the things that are necessary, and these are all on what is sometimes called the Probationary Path, the Path on which we get ready. And in order that you may realise that in this there is no difference between East and West, I may remind you that in the Roman Catholic Church—though it is not pressed on the attention of the ordinary Roman Catholic—this Path is also sketched out as possible; and in a remarkable book, called *The Graces of Interior Prayer*, you find the discipline which is to be followed, a discipline like that which we have here; and that Path of Preparation for Yoga, that I have just alluded to, is called the Path of Purification, or Purgation, in the Roman Catholic Church. Just as the goal in Yoga is Union with the Universal Āṭmā, Brahman Himself, so in the Roman Catholic Church they speak of the final success in the very strong word, the Deification of Man. Man is made God. As a great saint puts it vividly: "Become what you are."

And so in your study of Mysticism, when you take it up in detail, it would be well to be on the look-out for these various stages. Note them and recognise

them in many writers, in different countries, and in different ages. For always you will find these stages coming out in the different religions, whoever may be the Prophet who is the Founder, whoever may be the Teacher of any special creed. Looking at it in this way, you come to understand that all those higher qualities which man may develop and unfold in his evolution have to be developed on this Path, in order that it may be trodden with safety and without too serious set-backs. We are told that the Self cannot be found by a man without strength—a profound truth. He needs the strength of endurance, the strength of steadfastness, the strength of concentration, the strength of devotion, the strength of intellect. Every needed quality must be developed to the point of strength. This Path is not for the weakling. In that strength, one who sets himself to tread the narrow ancient Path finds that intellect is needed on the way; but it is written that beyond a certain stage intellect sinks back silent, and can carry us no further. Similarly with devotion; profound as it may be, that by itself cannot carry us to the Supreme; but it is also said that in the heart of him who is perfectly devoted, wisdom springs up in process of time, for no great faculty of the Self can develop alone. It brings others along with it, since all have to be blended; and although we speak of the Three Paths to Union—the path of Jñānam, Wisdom; the Path of Ichchhā, Will; the Path of Kriyā,

Activity—yet they all join into one at the end, and they are all summed up in that junction by the one word "Service". All the faculties of intellect have to be raised into Pure Reason, that great quality of Buḍḍhi, which is beyond even the splendour of the Higher Manas. Desire, turbulent in its nature, then becomes the immovable power of the Will. Kriyā, which busies us with the outer world, has to be changed into Sacrifice, for only the action which is sacrifice does not bind. Good activity and evil activity alike bind us to the world, very different in their result on character, very different in the direction that they give to evolution; but still a binding force, bringing us back over and over again, binding us fast to the ever-whirling wheel of life. And there is only one way in which those bonds, so exquisitely termed "the bonds of the heart," are broken, and that is by sacrifice, in which every action is seen as done by the One Doer, and the sense of separateness is lost in that very activity in which it is most emphasised in the lower life of man.

Now what I have been saying is the very essence of Mysticism, which comes out in many ways of expression, some obscure and some clear; which comes out in all ages of the world, whenever and wherever men have sought after Union with the Supreme. It is well for your instruction that you study these various expressions of Mysticism, which you will find as you follow its history in the various

Nations of the world, and the various centuries of time. You will find the Mystic, the Yogī, in every grade of life, rich or poor, high-born or low-born, prince or peasant, but everywhere working in the same spirit and walking along the razor path to the same goal. Some Teacher is ever near him, guiding his more rapid evolution; tempering to his strength, as it develops, the difficulties and obstacles that have to be overcome. He is never really alone, although seeming to be the loneliest of men; never really deserted, for, as says a Hebrew Prophet: "Underneath are the everlasting arms."

But it is true that the Yogī has to face darkness as well as light. If he dwells for long in the light, he may be blinded by the splendour of that brilliance, which his eyes are not yet fitted to gaze into undazzled. Every one who treads that Path knows what is called "the night of the Soul". It seems to me that that is laid more stress upon in the West than in the East; that there are more rapid alternations of a catastrophic character, more ecstasy and more agony, in the experience of the great Mystics of the West than in those of the East. And I am inclined to think that this is due to the fact that, on the whole, in the West the body has been too much disregarded. There is a profound difference in the way in which the body is regarded in the East and in the West. In the East it is looked on as embodying the Āṭmā, to be gradually purified,

refined, rendered delicate and subtle, in order that it may be the vehicle of the Spirit. It is not despised, except in those forms of Yoga which come under the ṭāmasic quality, of which Shrī Kṛshṇa speaks when He declares that there are some whose ṭapas (austerity) is ṭāmasic, who torture the body and " Me, seated in the body ". Except in those errant forms of Yoga, the discipline applied to the body in the East has been that temperate kind of which I spoke ; and, as though to emphasise that, the Lord Gauṭama Himself went through certain forms of Yoga until His body was made practically useless for the purpose of life, and He sank fainting on the ground, and was revived by the milk brought to Him by a peasant girl. After that, He gave up the torture of the body, and was consequently looked on as a failure by the ascetics who surrounded Him.

We are always inclined to run to extremes. It is much easier to be extreme than to tread steadfastly the middle path ; and I think it is largely because of that, that we find on the one side such great raptures of devotion, and on the other side such terrible blackness of the sense of desertion. It is marked in its reality as one of the great experiences that every Mystic has to pass through—what is called the Crucifixion of the Christ, when the darkness comes down for three hours, and through the darkness rings out the anguished cry of the Christ on the Cross : " My God ! my God ! why hast Thou forsaken me ? " It did

not last; it could not last. But one sometimes thinks that the shadow of that apparent terrible desertion has left a shade over Christendom, so that even the final word, showing that there was no desertion: "Father! into Thy hands I commend my Spirit," has not seemingly availed to remind the saint that, as the Son of Man is becoming the Son of God, for a moment he may lose the conscious touch with the God within, and with that, of course, the touch with the God without. That is an experience in the highest reaches of the Path, where everything goes, even the belief that there is a Self; and the disciple in the darkness simply stands, refusing to move lest he should fall into the void, knowing in his deepest nature that this is only an attempt of Māyā to delude him, to take away that without which he could not live in or out of a body, let alone as the Eternal. That is an experience that seems to be necessary, in order that a man may learn to stand absolutely alone. It comes out in a beautiful Irish legend, where a great warrior, fighting alone amid a host of enemies, and apparently deserted and betrayed, in his loneliness suddenly sees beside him a little child, the Child who is the Son of God, born into the knowledge of His Eternal Life. Such glimpses are given of great truths, from time to time, in the legends and myths that come down to us, which are very much truer than what is called history; for the myth is the experience of the inner

life, and history is only the Māyā of external events.

Try, then, to carry through your studies this Light of Theosophy, the Divine Wisdom, which we find most fully, perhaps, by careful study of the great Upanishaḍs. When you come to the lives of many Mystics that you will study, try to see in them what we may call their successes and their failures. Notice the differences, and yet the identity. You find a great Disciple, for instance, in Sir Thomas More, whose *Utopia* is not the dream of a dreamer, but the vision of one who was approaching Liberation. You may see it in Plato's *Republic*, disentangling it from the circumstances of the day, and seeing the great goal at which he aims, the perfect Society. You may see it with more difficulty in Jacob Boehme, the cobbler—and contrast it with that of the great Minister of Henry VIII—full of illumination, veiling his wisdom in the most abstruse formulæ and symbology; using alchemy and astrology as ways in which he can veil his meaning, because of the persecution to which he was exposed and the contempt of the City Fathers of his own city, who were not fit to touch his feet. But the cobbler lives, while the City Fathers are all forgotten, and is a signpost on the great Mystic Path. Then you will find the Cambridge Mystics, with their exquisite gleams of vision from time to time; and the Mystics of the Church of Rome, like S. Teresa, like S. John of the Cross, like Molinos, the Spanish

Mystic, coming down, perhaps, to the Quietist School in France, with Madame Guyon, groping after the true Mysticism.

Study them all and learn from them all, for much is to be learnt from the different angles of vision from which they look at God and at the world. Cultivate the spirit of the pupil who, while he is studying, does not challenge the statements among which he is searching for the truth which they contain. To find truth in any writer, you must try to touch his life rather than his words, and that needs sympathy more than analysis; try to develop that sympathy with the thought, which will bring you into touch with the writer, and make you realise what he is striving to express, however much he may be failing in expression. And, if in this way you can follow the deeper thought, the higher knowledge; if something within you bids you strive, even though it may be long before you can expect to attain; then despise nothing, because it seems little, that may help you; and remember that you help yourself most when you are helping others. Give freely of any knowledge which you gain, so that any soul thirsty for the water of knowledge may from you perhaps receive a drop or two; for the drop that you give to another becomes in you a springing well of the Life which is behind the veil.

Do not fear the darkness. Many have gone through it before you. Do not fear that it hides anything

that can touch you, you who are eternal although embodied in flesh. That which you are seeking is not knowledge of the outer, but realisation of the inner, to realise your own Self as one with the Universal Life. That is the crown of Yoga. In the darkest moments, remember the Light. In the moments when the unreal is blinding you, remember the Real. And if through the unreal you can cling to the Real; if through the darkness you never lose faith that the Light is there; then you shall find the Teacher who will guide you from death to immortality, and you shall *know*, with a conviction that nothing can shake, that nothing can alter, that God has made you in the image of His own Eternity.

RELIGION:

OR

GOD MANIFESTING AS LOVE

I AM to speak to-day on the Religions of the world, a very much easier subject than that of yesterday. There is one profound difference between the question of Religion taken as Mysticism, and Religion taken in its various forms adapted to the various circumstances, times, and conditions of evolution found when any special religion was promulgated.

There is one particular distinction that you might keep in mind between Religion as such, the very deepest, and the exoteric religions, those that have to do with the outer life of man and his growth through certain stages. That is the distinction that you find drawn in the famous answer given by Angiras to an enquirer as recorded in the *Muṇḍakopanishad*, where the enquirer asked what was Brahmavidyā. And the answer was that it was twofold: the Aparā, the lower—which included everything that was found in the Vedas, in Science, Literature, the Vedāṅgas, and Philosophy, such as the systems we now call the

Ḍarshanas and so on—and the knowledge of Him by whom all else becomes known, and that was the Parāviḍyā. It is partly from that, that our name Brahmaviḍyāshrama has been taken; because we are trying to unite these two, to recognise the lower, the teachable, and the higher, the unteachable—that which one man can teach another, and that which every man must learn to work out, discover, for himself.

It would not be, I think, an untrue definition to say that everything that can be taught makes the Aparāviḍyā; that which none can teach, but which is the revelation of the Self, to the Self, that is the Parāviḍyā. It is a distinction that is very seldom kept in mind. That Supreme knowledge, the Parāviḍyā, is a voyage of discovery for every individual by himself. I spoke of it yesterday as very lonely, for that reason. Each traveller travels into an unknown country, and each must make his own discoveries, depending on the inner strength that wells up within him. No one can teach him. In the one case he is continually being taught and helped and trained, shown how to develop his powers, shown how he may gradually grow in spiritual, intellectual and moral stature, and so on. Each religion leads the human being, the ego, always, as it were, by the hand, showing him how each part of his complicated mechanism is to be trained and disciplined; leading him higher and higher, until, having gained to a great extent

self-control, the power of self-discipline, the mastery over all his vehicles, he then can use them for his onward journey, which he must tread alone.

We have to deal to-day with what can be taught. Yesterday I tried to indicate some landmarks on the voyage of discovery, which each has to tread by himself. H.P.B. once said that she was expected to take her pupils to the Masters over the Himālayas in a Pullman car. But that is a feat of engineering that no one can accomplish. The pupils have to walk on their own feet.

Now the special light which is thrown by Theosophy, and which ought to guide you in all your studies of religions, is that they all come from the same source. Each of them is delivered by a World-Teacher. Each of them begins a new stage of civilisation with its own peculiar mark; while the religion given by the World-Teacher looks backward and around to see how people have come to the position they are in, and how to adapt the Ancient Truth to the new type; still more is it the foundation of a new civilisation. A new quality dominates each civilisation, and each of these qualities is one of the great jewels of religion, which is gradually developed by the ego as you cut a diamond, so that, instead of its looking like a piece of glass, you find that it reflects the colours of the spectrum: it dissociates colour from colour, and shows that all of them are present, even though one will dominate. The perfect

diamond, which reflects all the colours of the white light, is the most valuable of all from the standpoint of the jeweller. Then you sometimes get diamonds of a distinct colour—yellow, blue, or even black, they say.

The peculiarity of each religion is the thing you have first to look for. What is it intended to evoke from the sub-race to which it is given? What is the special quality which it has to bring out in that sub-race, and what is the contribution of the sub-race to the ultimately perfect humanity? There is a term used by H.P.B., and by many of the Great Teachers—the term of "The Heavenly Man". In one sense "The Heavenly Man" means the perfection of a Root-Race. For instance, there is the ideal of the Āryan Heavenly Man. He will show out many qualities, but all specially dominated by what used to be called the "fifth principle" or mode of consciousness, that of the intellect, and he will show it out in different ways. That will be shown out in every sub-race. In addition to that, every sub-race will show out what we may call sub-qualities, which are dominated by the mind (I am taking the fifth for the moment), are coloured by the mind, grow up in the atmosphere of the mind, so that you can distinguish between the same quality in a fourth-Race man and a fifth-Race man. When we have our fifth Round, we shall know, H.P.B. used to say, what intellect really means. At present we have Manas developed

in the fourth Round of our Chain. Hence it is largely clouded by Kāma, shows fundamentally the quality of the Lower Manas; and, while it is developed to an extent that to us often seems magnificent in the geniuses of the Races, we are told that when it comes to the fifth Round, and the fifth Race, then in the fifth sub-race of that we shall have a brilliancy and power of intellect that at present we cannot conceive.

That image of "The Heavenly Man" shows us a single body, as it were, into which all the qualities of the Race are brought, and also the sub-qualities. As that Heavenly Man is seen in the world where these lower divisions do not exist, where you get every individual and every Nation respectively like a cell and an organ in the human body, which has its own individuality but at the same time is dominated by the Life of the whole body, so in the Heavenly Man you see a form in the higher world, and into this are built all the qualities and sub-qualities of the Race that He represents. I think you will find that to be a very useful idea to keep before your minds in the study of religions. You will first try to see the characteristics common to all of them. Then you will look for the things that are separate in them, the specialities of the religion, the things that distinguished one from the other. These two things, the unity and the specialities, are the things that you want to select out of the religion in your analysis of

it, so that you may get a clearly-cut idea of the special gift which that religion and sub-race give to the building up of the ideal, "The Heavenly Man". I have found in my own study that the way in which Theosophy both analyses and synthesises—these two ways of the mind—helps us enormously in the clearness of our ideas, and in the relative importance which may be given to the different parts of the same subject. We are inclined to be lop-sided. We need a corrective, and that corrective is given us by the study of the Divine Wisdom. We are going to try, in the work which is done here, under each of the great heads, to utilise Theosophy as an illuminator. A phrase comes into one's mind from one of the *Psalms of David*: "Thy Word is a Light unto my feet"; and I think the Divine Wisdom is pre-eminently a Light unto our feet.

The next great idea that I want to take as a guide is that there is always a World-Teacher, one great Being; but He does not belong to one Race, as the Manu does. It is a rather curious point, and I have never been able quite to realise what it indicates, but some great principle must be indicated in the fact that a Manu and a Boḍhisaṭṭva always work together. They are a pair; and that at once suggests to us "the pairs of opposites". They are supplementary to each other, and we can see, looking back into history, how These Two keep together; how, when They are preparing for Their high offices, They are

continually brought together into the same life, go through life together, helping each other, supplementing each other, the deficiency of the one being made good by the excellences of the other. They are like two parts of a single form, and until you have the two you cannot realise Their work. More and more They become assimilated as they tread the higher reaches of the Path. Where They pass on into Liberation, you find Them working still side by side until the sixth great Initiation—that of the Chohan—after which They pass the seventh, but there One becomes the Manu of a Race and the other a Boḍhisaṭṭva. I cannot say the Boḍhisaṭṭva of a Race. That is the peculiar thing. The Boḍhisaṭṭva takes up His function of Teaching at a point at which His Predecessor becomes a Buḍḍha, and He comes in and takes a certain sub-race, say the fourth Root-Race, under His care, as the Lord Gauṭama did. He was the Boḍhisaṭṭva who occupied that great Post through the later sub-races of the fourth Root-Race. On the other hand, the Lord Vaivasvaṭa Manu, the Manu of the fifth Root-Race, took up His work of preparation long before, the work of separating His Race out of the fifth sub-race of the fourth Root-Race. That went on through a very long period of time in Atlantis, before He brought them by way of the Sahāra, which was then a great sea, across Egypt into Arabia, where they settled for a long time, and then onward through Mesopotamia

until the northern part of Asia was reached, and the shores of the great Northern Sea, and then a little southwards, where they finally settled down round the waterway that separated the White Island from all the surrounding country, and built the "City of the Bridge".

While you find the Manu and the Boḍhisaṭṭva very closely connected, there is this curious difference between them. The Lord Gauṭama appears as the World-Teacher in the fourth Race where He takes up that Office. The Lord Vaivasvaṭa Manu works in preparation for His fifth Root-Race, taking it out of the fifth sub-race of the fourth Root-race and bringing it away and segregating it after going through long journeys. We know exactly in how many sub-races of the fifth Root-Race the Boḍhisaṭṭva appeared as the World-Teacher. We know how He appeared as Vyāsa to the Root-Stock of the Āryan Race. Then we hear of Him as Thoth in Egypt, in the first of the Emigrations, the second sub-race. That name is more familiar in the records of religions under the Greek form of Hermes Trismegistos, the Thrice Greatest, so called to distinguish Him from Hermes, the Messenger of the Gods, who was a Ḍeva. The World-Teacher in Egypt was then known under the Egyptian name of Thoth and under the Greek name of Hermes. In *The Book of the Dead*, and in remnants of Egyptian records which have been

translated, you will read a great deal about that wonderful Revelation of His. Just as in the Hinḍū Religion He took the Sun as the great symbol of the Deity, and Nārāyaṇa in the Sun became the centre of worship, so in Egypt you find a similar symbol, spoken of as "The Light" more than as the Sun, though the latter is His manifestation, as in the Egyptian religion you have Ra and Osiris, different names for the Sun. But the fundamental idea in the Egyptian religion is less the Sun than the Light through the Sun. In the Fourth Gospel there is the phrase: "The Light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world." That is a purely Egyptian idea. The Fourth Gospel was written in Africa, and is partly Greek and partly Egyptian. All the symbology is the Light and the Darkness. The powers of matter and of evil are typified in the great Dragon of the Darkness. He tears Osiris into pieces, and scatters his body, so that the pieces have to be put together before he can rise from the ashes of the dead. The great symbol of the Resurrection of the New from the Old is Egypt's symbol of the Pelican—called very often by other names in Egypt—that feeds its young from its own breast. The Phœnix was one of the names that it had, and the legend was that at one time in the year a Phœnix came to Egypt and threw itself into a great fire which was prepared for it. It was burnt to ashes, and a new

Phœnix arose from the ashes—a vivid symbol of the way in which life is reincarnated in new forms; and in that way the doctrine of Reincarnation was spread in Egypt. In Egypt, the King was bidden: "Look for the Light," that he might remember, amid all his pomp and his pride of power, that the Divine Light shone in his subjects as in himself. The people were told: "Follow the Light." And in the Mysteries they were commanded, as they stood in the symbolic darkness: "Seek for the Light."

Then again we know that the World-Teacher also was the Founder of the great *Zoroastrian* Religion. He came as *Zarathushtra*, and gave the second of the great migrations, the third sub-race, the Persians, their ancient religion which survives among the Pārsīs to-day. His last reincarnation in our fifth Root-Race was when He came as Orpheus to Greece, the Founder of the Mysteries there, as He had been of the Egyptian Mysteries and the Persian Mysteries. The Mysteries of Mithra came from the Persian Prophet, as the Mysteries of Greece had their root in the Mysteries of Orpheus.

I ought to have said that in His Third Manifestation, in Persia, He took another form, the Fire. The Sun, the Light, the Fire, these are the three great visible manifestations of the Deity in these three religions. In the fourth sub-race He

changed His symbol and adopted Sound. The Orphic Mysteries work through Music; the idea in them is Harmony, Beauty; and it is because of the way in which notes are welded together into richer chords, that out of that the dominant characteristic of the Greek Religion, shaping the Greek civilisation, took its note of Beauty. Beauty is the mark of the Greek or the Kelt (Greek is too narrow a name), just as Purity is the mark in Persia, and the Higher Science is the mark in Egypt, and the deepest Philosophy and Metaphysic was the mark in the Root-Stock of the Āryan Race. God was hidden in the Sun, the Light and the Fire; He was made manifest in Beauty.

Looking at it, then, in that way, you have a definite Design. We have these four—the Root-Stock and its three sub-races—all under the same Great Being who then appeared as the Prince Siḍḍhārtha, the Lord Gauṭama, who became the Buḍḍha, reaching Illumination at Gayā, under the Tree, who then, when He went to Saranath, began the turning of the Wheel of the Law; He lived for forty years, ṭeaching His sublime form of the great Wisdom Religion; and passed away from the world. His work as the direct Teacher of this World was over, and He gave His place to the Ṛshi Maiṭreya, who then became the World-Teacher, the Jagaṭ Guru or, as the Buḍḍhists have it, the Boḍhisaṭṭva.

Now through these four—the Root-Stock and its sub-races—you will find in every one of them a great appeal to the mind. Here in India, in the Root-Stock of the Fifth Race, the Race in which Mind was to be developed, look right back to the various works of literature in all four; you see everywhere the mark of Mind. The keenness of the intellect, the power and the grasp of the mind, show out strongly in the Indian. When you come to Egypt, you see the lower mind at work under the guidance of the intellect; later, when we come to look at Science, we shall have to recognise the great lead given by Egypt. 'The Wisdom of Egypt" is one of the phrases of the older world. Then, when you come to Persia, you find the purifying quality, and much stress laid upon Purity, because it is on the purity of the mind that true insight depends. In Greece, Beauty was the salient outer mark, Beauty as the expression of mind. You have the power of the Greek mind, which comes out in the wonderful structure of the Greek language, its melody, power, virility, and perfection of form. Whether you take it in the Greek Arts, like their Architecture which still remains the model of Europe; whether you take it as science; whether you think of it as the perfection of form in statuary, painting, or literature, trace it down through those schools of Ancient Greece and Egypt and see how they re-flower in Arabia, under the inspiration of the Prophet of Arabia, who gave one of the most splendid

definitions of science that has ever been given to us; on the whole of these the mark of the Lord Buḍḍha, the Buḍḍha of Wisdom, is stamped. You find in all these that the Lord Gauṭama Buḍḍha shone out in Wisdom pre-eminently, and among His followers He is called the Buḍḍha of Wisdom.

Then there comes a great change, and a very remarkable change, a change for which I think you should try to find the reason in your studies. I will indicate it, as it seems to me in the light of Theosophical study. Instead of the Buḍḍha of Wisdom you have the Buḍḍha of Compassion, the Lord Maiṭreya; a change of atmosphere, as it were. To Him is due the wondrous Kṛṣhṇa cult of India, of which people do not seem able to find the origin. It seems to have come full-grown. It bears the great characteristic of India, the idea of supreme devotion to a special Incarnation of Love. You have to think of Shrī Kṛṣhṇa as the Child Kṛṣhṇa, the youth Kṛṣhṇa; sporting with the Gopīs, playing on His Flute, and drawing everything to Him by the wonderful melody. All the animals and birds were said to come round Him, and the very trees were said to bend towards Him. He became, as the Child, the very Ideal to worship in the Indian Home. It is profoundly instructive and moving to see how that appeals sometimes to people whom you would scarcely think would be so sensitive. I have sometimes given to people, whom I knew to be devotees of the Lord Kṛshṇa, one of those little tiny

ivory carvings, the size of the thumb, of Shrī Kṛshṇa as a Child. I gave one of these, one day, to a Vaishya gentleman, a merchant, who seemed to be a most unpromising subject for devotion in his outward manifestation. I knew him to be a devotee, and so I gave him the Baby Kṛshṇa. I was surprised at the way in which he took it into his hand and just gazed at it for a time; and then tears began to roll down his cheeks and he whispered: "Oh! The little Child! The little, little Child." And that idea of the Child as the Ruler and Supporter of the world may be said to be the very heart of the widespread Kṛshṇa cult. It is said that when His foster-mother thought that He had put something into His mouth, she tried to open it, till He laughed up at her and opened it, and then she saw the universe within it.

Lastly, you have in Christianity—and that is the special point you should think over—you have, as its great mark, the development of individuality, because, without the development of the individual, the next stage in evolution, that of the sixth sub-race, could not come in a powerful and really useful form. It was necessary to develop the concrete mind, the combative mind of the individual, in the fifth sub-race; and therefore enormous stress is laid in Christianity on the value of the individual. The great difference between the two civilisations of East and West turns very largely upon that point. Christendom, in its political aspect, is based on the individual, and hence

the doctrine of Rights—the rights of the individual—is absolutely necessary for this development. On the other hand, the Asian civilisations, and pre-eminently that of India, are based on the family, not on the individual, on the man in Society, not on the man in isolation. The husband, the wife, and the child—that is the social unit in India. The human being is not single, isolated. The human being is the man, woman, and child. And so you get the phrase of the Lord Manu, where He says: "Woman is created to be a mother; and, to be a father, man." You have, then, on the one side a family, and on the other an individual, as the unit in Society; and the dominating idea in the one is *Duty* and in the other Rights.

When you come to the sixth sub-race, you will come back to the ideal of the family—individuals uniting together in Society, and working for the common good. And that is indicated in the second great characteristic of Christianity, which is, first, the development of strength, and then the use of strength, not for oppression, but for Service. When the disciples of the Christ quarrelled as to who should be the greatest among them in the future kingdom, He rebuked them and said: "The greatest among you is he that doth serve. I am among you as he that serveth." You have the ideal of Service as the other side of Christianity; and, linked together with the development of the individual, it means that the

greater the strength a man has, the greater is his responsibility and his power of Service. Strength should be used to uplift, and not to trample down. Those two ideas are the great contribution of Christianity to the world and to the civilisation founded by the fifth sub-race of the Fifth Root-Race; it is for the religion of the West, of the fifth sub-race, to gather up these things until they shall balance each other in the perfect development of the typical man of the Fifth Race, in which, if you look at it from the standpoint of the higher world, the Manu is the Brain, the Boḍhisaṭṭva the Heart.

You will notice that the Boḍhisaṭṭva comes for the last time, as the Lord Buḍḍha, at about the middle of the Root-Race. Three sub-races preceded Him, three sub-races are to follow Him, and He is born in the Root-Stock. I do not understand why it should be so; but there must be a good reason; it may be that, in the course of the comparative examination of religions, some ray of light may be possibly found in your studies. I have often thought it over, but have never been able to find a satisfactory answer to my own question on it; and you know, when one becomes a student of the Wisdom, one tries to discover for oneself; one does not like to trouble the Masters with questions. It seems absurd to bother Them with our small difficulties. So I shall be very glad if, out of your studies here, some light can be thrown on this problem of the two great Entities who came

up together, age after age, coming through a Chain before our own, side by side; and, at the particular point of culmination in the high Initiation—into the offices to which only three of the Hierarchy are appointed, the Manu, the Boḍhisaṭṭva and the Mahā-Chohan—have this curious difference with regard to Their relationship to the Race. Probably some connecting link is wanted between these Races, which may be forged by this peculiarity of the Manu, on the one side, and the Boḍhisaṭṭva on the other.

I do not know whether, in speaking of the particular religions which came out of the teaching of the Boḍhisaṭṭva, before He became the Buḍḍha, and the Christian religion, and the two yet to come, to be founded during this Race by the present Boḍhisaṭṭva, who will become a Buḍḍha in the Sixth Root-Race—I am not forgetting the special gift to the earth, with which He is still so closely connected—it puzzles you that I should draw a distinction of any kind between Beings so unspeakably more highly evolved than anything which we are able to compass with our intelligence: why one is called the Buḍḍha of Wisdom and the other the Buḍḍha of Compassion. Both these splendid qualities are needed in what we call the Heavenly Man, both in the Head and the Heart. If you look at the lives of the two, taking the life of the Lord Gauṭama after He became the Buḍḍha, and the life of the Christ as He manifested in Judea, as can be gathered fairly accurately from the Gospels,

you will find that this difference in quality is shown out in a very marked way. There is a story of the Lord Buḍḍha to whom a woman came, carrying her dead child; she came to Him, as to a great Teacher with powers over life and death, and prayed that the child's life might be restored to the body. The answer of the Lord Buḍḍha was a somewhat strange one. He told her to go to the different houses near by, and to bring Him a mustard-seed from any house in which not one person had died. She went off joyfully, because she thought that life would come back to her little one. She went from house to house, but nowhere did she find it. Every family had lost some one by death. Finally she came back and said: "Lord! I cannot find it; there is no house in which some one has not died." On that fact He based His teaching of the Law to which all mortals were subject, and by the wisdom of His words He took away from her her sorrow, and He enlightened her mind. He told her of the universality of death, and therefore the folly of mourning over a special manifestation of it, and thus removed for her the root of sorrow. There you had His great characteristic, the radical curing of sorrow. That was His special mission—the cause and cure of sorrow, the understanding of those great laws under which we live, by which, once understood, all sorrows cease.

If you contrast that, for the moment, with the story of what is called the raising of Lazarus, or of

the daughter of Jairus—a ruler whose little daughter had died—in each case the Christ was appealed to, and in each He called back the life that had temporarily fled, moved by the sorrow of the people round Him, giving a concrete example of Divine Compassion, of Sympathy. The sorrows of the sisters who had lost their brother, and of the father who had lost his daughter, were lifted away from them, by giving back to them the one they loved. In the Lord Buḍḍha shone out the Wisdom of God, manifested in the Laws of Nature, obedience to which would put an end to pain; in the Lord Christ, God's Sympathy with the sufferings of immature Humanity. Are not both priceless revelations of the Nature of the Life in which "we live and move and have our being"? Should we not be the poorer if we had only been given one? The two sides of the Divine life, the Wisdom-side and the Love-side, both are equally necessary to the helping of humanity, and the lifting of the world.

One ventures to think, in looking at these mighty Two, whether it was because the harder side of man had to be developed, the combative, the struggling side, necessary for the development of the individual; whether, because of that, the correction was given to it in the manifestation of the Christ with His wonderful tenderness for human suffering, which suggested the underlying Love when the Law struck the heart with anguish, in order that the mind might

not harden the heart, and Love might not be wholly submerged, even in the struggles which create Individuality. This is only a suggestion which has come to me as a possible reason why there should be the difference between the two methods of dealing with sorrow, the great sorrow of death. There was no danger, in the time when the Lord Buḍḍha lived, of the element of love disappearing. The family ties were too strong to make it necessary to strengthen the feeling of obligation. On the other hand, when the individual had to be developed, when more and more antagonism arose by this development of individuality, just in the same way as reincarnation became submerged because it diminished the value of the individual life, and made it one of a great chain in which the achievements of one life could make up for the failures of another, so in the development of strength it was necessary to teach man that tenderness must go with strength, so that it might be used for the helping of those around him, instead of crushing them down with mental indifference to suffering.

But what are we but children, making reasons for the actions of Those high as the stars above us? And yet, I think it is instructive for us to try to understand. We may make mistakes in our childishness, but still it may be useful that we should try. To dwell in reverent thought on these wondrous Ones must raise us. There is no danger of any

of you slipping into the blunder of making an adverse judgment, a comparison in that sense, to the detriment of a mighty Teacher of mankind. They manifest different qualities of perfection for our helping, adapted to the circumstances of the time. We may perhaps be able to bring out of that, in our analysis, that we also must adapt ourselves to the conditions in which we find ourselves and bring the right remedy to each disease. This is not a question of comparison of greatness, but only of putting two perfections side by side, and realising how they supplement each other, and how each is necessary for the ultimate perfection of humanity.

It is along these general lines that I would counsel you to study the separate religions, because in that way you learn that they are not rivals, but sisters, and that our duty to those of any religion, to which we may not ourselves belong, is to try to learn from the difference to enrich our own, and not to find in the difference a cause for unkind judgment or harsh criticism.

PHILOSOPHY:

OR

GOD MANIFESTING AS UNDERSTANDING

WITH this morning's subject, Philosophy, we pass into another division of our constitution. You will find it helpful to bear in mind in your studies that the various branches of human thought, of human emotion, and human action may be looked upon as the foundation of certain great divisions in the human constitution. It is one of the illuminating conceptions of the Divine Wisdom that, wherever we look, whether it be at the divisions of mankind, the divisions of Races, the divisions of Nations, and so on, or the divisions of the human constitution, we find that they are all built up on the great manifestation of Ishvara as triple, sub-dividing again into seven. If you take that as a kind of basis, examining it, of course, with your own minds, and adapting it with your own thought, you will find that you will not stray very far from the central line of thought in each case.

In our first two subjects, Mysticism and Religion, we were dealing especially with the activities of the

human being in the two higher planes of his being, in the fivefold universe, the Āṭmā and Buḍḍhi. In relation to Buḍḍhi we have as reflection the emotional plane, emotion and Buḍḍhi being very much more closely related to each other than Manas and Buḍḍhi. And that division comes out very plainly in modern Philosophy, where it seems to be recognised by men like Bergson that, in looking at the human being, we must distinguish these stages of evolution; and what he speaks of as instinct—accumulated experience, as it is sometimes called, born with a creature—is related to Buḍḍhi rather than to the intellectual faculty. The fact is that there are very few people at present who can initiate any form of activity from the Buḍḍhic plane. From the emotional, however, in its highest stage, there is a response from that quality, that characteristic, or mode of consciousness, that we speak of as Buḍḍhi. Both really deal with the emotion of Love, in its lower and in its higher forms, and that is the great unifying force. It is Love that draws together, while, on the other hand, Intellect divides and drives apart; it is the I-creating principle.

In man we have the triplicity, Āṭmā, Buḍḍhi and Manas. Āṭmā is sometimes called the triple Āṭmā, because, in the case of the higher human evolution, Buḍḍhi and Manas merge, disappear, in Āṭmā, giving it that reproduction of Īshvara, which you may carry right up to the Saguṇa Brahman, the triple aspect of the Saguṇa Brahman, that reproduces itself in the

Ishvaras of the many systems, and again in the consciousness of man.

Looking at that consciousness, we find that it unfolds, in its descent into matter, the Āṭmā, and then, putting forth the other aspects, as it were, it takes to itself certain atoms of the two succeeding planes. There you have the reincarnating entity, the life which lasts from incarnation to incarnation, the reproduction really and primarily of the Monad, part of Ishvara Himself; and then the unfolding of that, stage by stage, in order that there may be the evolution of matter, which has to correspond with the unfolding of Spirit. Then you have the reflection of that again in the lower divisions, which we often call the personality of man, the reflection of the creative activity of the intellect in the concrete mind; the emotions and passions reflecting in dense matter the unifying power of Buḍḍhi; and finally the highest, the Will, the Āṭmā, reflecting itself in the organ of action, the physical body. When you have that outline in your mind, so that it is always there, and so that the various studies that you take up fit themselves into it almost instinctively, you find your study very much clarified; and perhaps that is especially necessary when you are dealing with the enormously complicated subject of the philosophies of the world. From one standpoint these may trench on Religion, not by assimilating Buḍḍhi, but by the necessity which is often felt by the analytic faculty of

the human reason of unifying its own thoughts, of definitely recognising certain great principles out of which all else flows, and rising into the Intellect, with its synthesising faculty.

Now, what is Philosophy? The word means "the love of wisdom"; but when we ask what it really is, we find it is the definite intellectual attempt to understand the universe in which man finds himself as a part. In most Philosophies, but not necessarily in all, primarily the object of research is the nature of God; the second object of research is the nature of man; and these two are brought together, and Philosophy endeavours to ascertain and express the relation between them. So you have God, Man—as symbolising the universe, the I and the Not-I—and the relation between these; thus the constant attempt of the highest human Intellect is to form an intellectual system, which ought to be complete in all its parts with regard to this great triple object.

I was obliged to make a reservation, because in some systems the first (God) is left out, as, for instance, in the Sāṅkhya. It begins with a duality, Puruṣha and Prakṛṭi; and you have a profoundly interesting account of the method of evolution in Prakṛṭi, by what Paṭañjali calls the propinquity of Puruṣha. Puruṣha is there as a witness, but is at the same time the inspirer of everything, setting in motion the machine of Prakṛṭi. The word "propinquity" is rather a curious one, as it implies nearness in space;

but, if you take it as the establishment of relations, you will have a truer and fuller idea. The Sāṅkhya philosophy is sometimes spoken of, I think unwisely, as atheistic. If you take the word a-theistic in the true Greek sense of the term, as meaning "without God," the "a" being a privative, it does not imply any sense of antagonism. It is not anti-theistic. It deals with the derived, as it were, and does not concern itself with That from which the derivation of Purusha *cum* Prakṛti takes place. But, as you are aware, the Sāṅkhya system is constantly put as a pair with the Yoga system of Paṭañjali, which is called the theistic Sāṅkhya. Putting it into other language, we should say that the Sāṅkhya has to deal with the involution of Life into matter, and the evolution of form shaped and moulded by that Life; and it is along that line its great author seeks to present an intellectual view of the universe, or, in other words, a philosophy of the universe.

Paṭañjali deals with the origin of all, and teaches the mystic way to Self-realisation: how that Self-Realisation is to be brought about in a thoroughly scientific manner; and it is the abstract science of his exposition which places his special examples and explanations in the grade of Philosophy, rather than in the form of Mysticism, or Religion, although so very closely allied to both.

When you take the definite view I am suggesting of the constitution of man, you sometimes find

reconciling points, where people without that knowledge have found differences and antagonisms; and this is peculiarly so in the case of the greatest of all systems, the Veḍānṭa. There you have the crown of the human Intellect. You find it penetrating the Upanishaṭs; you find it when you come to Greek philosophy, to the German philosophy of later times and so on, always reproducing certain great, all-embracing ideas. But the Veḍānṭa is spoken of as divided into three views, or schools: the Aḍvaiṭa, without duality; the Vishiṣhtāḍvaiṭa, the Aḍvaiṭa with a difference; and the Ḍvaiṭa, Duality. Unfortunately those who follow one or other of these three systems are very apt to quarrel vehemently with each other. It is a characteristic of intellectual systems that, until the unifying force of the Spirit is felt, intellectual divisions are so sharp, so clear, so emphatic in their statements, that their exponents very readily rush into somewhat unphilosophical antagonisms, especially those who think more of the words than of the spirit of the philosophy itself. Really what you have in those three systems is the idea of Liberation which, you must remember, underlies all the Indian schools of Philosophy. You have there the different types of Liberation, according to the angle of vision which is taken by the student in each case.

If you take the Ḍvaiṭa, the Duality, there the man is striving upwards towards the Ego, and is thinking

of that Ego as passing into Buḍḍhi, merging in Buḍḍhi. Putting that in a rather more concrete form, at the first great Initiation, the causal body, called Vijñānamayakosha, dissolves, breaks up. The consciousness, impressed with everything which has been gained by the exercise of the Higher Manas, passes on into Buḍḍhi, and realises the union of lives. There is the distinction, constant and permanent, between the creative or emanating Life, and the fragments of that Life as embodied in the objects of the universe, and in the higher form of humanity, the "crown of creation". Man rules with the strong Intellect, marking out individuality. He reaches the Buḍḍhic plane, and that is his Liberation. On that plane he knows from within, and not from without. He loses, as it were, the intellectual aspect of looking outwards, which is the great mark of the Intellect, the recognition of the Not-I, bringing out, of course, the recognition of the I, and finds an inner union of his life with all lives.

Then, in the Vishiṣhtāḍvaiṭa, you have the idea of Liberation where Buḍḍhi, in turn, passes into the Āṭmā, and the original triple Āṭmā again appears—if one may use the phrase—as an entity, though the word entity gives the idea of separation.

Then you have the Aḍvaiṭa. You have in that the merging of the triple Āṭmā in the Monad of the Theosophical terminology, the Fragment of Deity—the Father, from the standpoint of the fivefold

universe; the Son, from the standpoint of the sevenfold universe, in which the Son ever remains in the bosom of the Father, never separate from Him, but as a centre in Him.

And this leads me to say one word which, I think, you will have to keep as a steady thought right through, in all the questions that you meet in the various philosophies as to the meaning of "absorption," the Nirvāṇa of the Buḍḍhist, and the various ideas of Moksha, the true Nirvāṇa of the Hinḍū. In all of these, if you wish to have the nearest approach to the truth that human limited intelligence and consciousness can gain, you must not think of what is called the drop merging in the ocean, that is, of the drop disappearing, which is the idea that the western student of eastern Philosophy usually adopts. What you have to think of (though it seems a contradiction) is the drop expanding into the ocean, and still keeping its own centre. It would not be much use building up individuality if, at the end, all was to be thrown away, and the individual was to be the same on returning to "the bosom of the Father," as when he came from it. That is not the view which comes from an increasing knowledge of the expansions of consciousness, which is, after all, all that we have to guide us in our own experience. If you take the consciousness of the Higher Ego, you have a very strongly marked Individuality, a very distinct separating body—using that word for a kind of permanent

enclosure of matter in which resides a certain stage of consciousness, which is essentially the I developing its I-ness, intensifying that sense of the I, by contrast with the universe around, in which the I does not find that its own consciousness is working. He is looking at it from outside, not from within it; and so he feels intensely the sharp separation between the I and the Not-I. But when the I-ness drops his causal body, his material from the higher mental plane, and passes on into the Buḍḍhic, there is an immense expansion of consciousness, but there is no loss of that centre; he expands so as to include any of the consciousnesses which are acting on that plane. In a sense, he becomes all of them, and yet he never loses the sense of his own centre. He identifies himself with another with a closeness of identity that we know nothing of below that plane. But still there is the subtle memory of past experiences which gives it a little different hue, or colour, or fragrance, or whatever delicate word you can use to symbolise an existence which is almost impalpable and yet that remains, colouring, as it were, the Buḍḍhic consciousness. There is that tremendous expansion; and if, when you are studying the various philosophies, you keep that in mind, you will find every now and then a phrase which becomes intelligible when you have that thought in your mind. In Plotinus, you will find a wonderful description of Buḍḍhic consciousness, in which he speaks of the Star which is itself and all the

other Stars, as the striking fact of what we should now call the Buḍḍhic body—or rather, the Buḍḍhic sheath, to make a distinction between the enclosure and the appropriation of matter which does not separate. The Buḍḍhic sheath is a radiating Star, not an enclosure. If you see a person in the Buḍḍhic body on the Buḍḍhic plane, you do not see an enclosure; you see a Star radiating out in all directions, whose rays pierce your consciousness so that you feel it to be a part of yourself, and yet not quite. It is almost impossible, except by a series of contradictions, to describe states of consciousness to which our language does not adapt itself. Of course, in Samskṛṭ, you get an enormously more developed form of language, from the philosophical standpoint, than in English; yet in trying to make people understand, you must use a language that they will understand, and Samskṛṭ is known by comparatively few people in the West. We are rather trying to eliminate the Samskṛṭ terms without loss of accuracy. The experience of the Buḍḍhic plane is not translatable into words down here; but you do get indications of it, and they are generally called (when people read of them with no realisation of what they mean) "obscure," "vague," "indeterminate," etc. But it is quite clear, and not vague, to anyone who touches it. It is one of the great facts of consciousness that you can never understand a stage which you have not reached. You cannot understand consciousness by

looking at it from outside. I was answering a letter yesterday in which there was the question: "Why did God make the universe?". I suggested that there were many possible reasons, but that a kitten cannot understand why a man spends his time reading a book instead of running after a leaf on the ground, because the consciousness of the kitten is not developed enough to read a book; and we are all nearer to the kitten than to Ishvara in one sense, in our comprehension of His nature. It is quite true that

> Closer is He than breathing,
> Nearer than hands and feet,

but you have to stretch your consciousness to accept contradictions.

On the other hand, when the consciousness begins to dawn, as it has to dawn, through the help of some one greater than yourself (otherwise it would shatter you), when, enveloped in the consciousness of another, you may touch the next plane, then the sense of absolute unity comes upon you, and you may say that the difference does disappear, but it disappears by expansion and not by extinguishment. That is why I said that, if you would think of the drop expanding into the ocean and sharing the consciousness of the ocean, you would have a truer idea of Nirvāṇa, which so many western writers call annihilation, though it is the fulness of Life.

I said the consciousness would be shattered. If you think for a moment of films of matter, however

fine they may be, you will find that they have a certain limit of vibration, and that they can answer to and reproduce certain other limits of vibration. You also find that, if you take a very much more rapid rate of vibration, you break the enclosure, shatter it to pieces. That is true of all aggregations of matter, so far as we know them. There is a limit beyond which they cannot respond, and then they simply are shattered. That would be the effect if you were suddenly to find yourselves on the Nirvāṇic plane, if not prepared for it. You would simply have to burst, like a bubble vanishing. It is a very long job to build it again, the film of the bubble. Therefore people are prevented from going into it, unless it may happen that persons may be taken into it, to show them certain occurrences, certain truths, and then they are shielded, just as a diving-dress is given to the man who goes into water. Protective sheaths are possible all the way up.

There is, in the Buḍḍhist Philosophy, a wonderful sentence of the Lord Gauṭama Buḍḍha, where He is striving to indicate in human language something that would be intelligible about the condition of Nirvāṇa. You find it in the Chinese translation of the *Ḍhammapaḍa*, and the Chinese edition has been translated into English in the series of books known as "Trübner's Series". He puts it there that, unless there was Nirvāṇa, there could be nothing ; and He uses various phrases in order to indicate what He means, taking

4

the uncreated and then connecting with it the created; taking the real and then connecting with it the unreal. He sums it up by saying that Nirvāṇa is; and that, if it were not, naught else could be. That is an attempt (if one may call it so with all reverence) to say what cannot be said. It implies that unless there existed the Uncreate, the Invisible and the Real, we could not have a universe at all. You have there, then, the indication that Nirvāṇa is a plenum, not a void.[1] That idea should be fundamentally fixed in your mind, in your study of every great system of Philosophy. So often the expressions used may seem to indicate a void. Hence the western idea of

[1] The following are the shlokas referred to:

Bhikkhus, the uncreated, the invisible, the unmade, the elementary, the unproduced exist, (as well as) the created, the visible, the made, the conceivable, the compound, the produced; and there is an uninterrupted connection between the two.

Bhikkhus, if the uncreated, the invisible, the unmade, the elementary, the unproduced was nonentity*, I could not say that the result of their connection from cause to effect with the created, the visible, the made, the compound, the conceivable was final emancipation.†

Bhikkhus, it is because of the real existence of the uncreated, the invisible, the elementary, the unproduced, that I say that the result of their connection from cause to effect with the created, the visible, the made, the compound, the conceivable is final emancipation.—*Udānavarga*, xxvi, 21—23.

* "If nirvāṇa was annihilation"—P.

† *Nges-par-hbyung*. This term is generally used for *niryanika* (Pāli, *niyyāniko*), "final emancipation". See Jaschke, S. V. "Nges-pa." The Commentary explains it by "that which really exists, consequently the condition (bhava, *dngos*) of the other world is not nothingness. All conditions (*dngos*) are related, and it cannot be conceived that there is one that is isolated: light is (connected) with darkness, heat with cold, etc. . . . What then is nirvāṇa? It is the end of suffering and final emancipation (*unges-hbyung*) and life (*dus*) without end." See Commentary, Vol. LXXII, fol. 93.

annihilation. If you think of it as fulness, you will realise that the consciousness expands more and more, without losing utterly the sense of identity; if you could think of a centre of a circle without a circumference, you would glimpse the truth.

In the various systems of Philosophy that you will study, you will take up, of course, the six Ḍarshanas of Hinḍūism. You will study the Aḍvaiṭa Philosophy, perhaps the most all-inclusive. The Intellect endeavours to translate into terms of itself, and therefore necessarily into clear-cut ideas, the great truths of the Spirit. There is where the difficulty comes in. If you desire to develop your Intellect (I am putting the lower mind aside), you must be prepared to face a perfect clarity of atmosphere, and many people call it "cold". Intellect is not supposed to be "warm"; that is the function of emotion; and intellectual grasp is blurred by emotion. Intellect is essentially that which (taking up from the lower mind all that it has analysed) synthesises this into some likeness of a part of the great truth which the Spirit hands down. It must be partial. Just as the white light of the sun, passed through a prism, is split into colours, so is it with the Intellect in the human consciousness. It is literally a prism, and, when the white light from the Spirit-world shines down, the intellect splits it into colours, and it cannot quite re-combine them, and is therefore always imperfect. You distinguish it from the concrete or scientific view, because

science confines itself to the outward-looking observation of phenomena and to the process of classification. And from that it gradually tries to find out some underlying unity by induction; and so it finds a law of Nature, a great principle unfolding into a series of phenomena, and so on. The Intellect, whose "nature is knowledge," does not work in that way. It recognises truth by its accord with itself. Leibnitz spoke of perfect knowledge as finally intuitive. That is why I do not quite like the word "intuition" for Buḍḍhi, as there is an intellectual intuition which is entirely different in kind from the intuition of Buḍḍhi, which is really Self-Realisation. I do not know how Leibnitz included it in that perfect knowledge. What it does mean, looking from the standpoint of Hinḍū Philosophy, is that Intellect is (as just quoted from a Upanishaṭ) of the nature of knowledge. It is knowledge itself, contracted into this individualised form; and the peculiarity of it is that intellectual intuition is not a matter of reasoning out, as the greater part of Philosophy is, but a matter of direct recognition. The only thing to which I have been able to compare it satisfactorily in my own mind, is the different way in which a musician judges a note of music, from the way that a scientific man calculates the number of vibrations that make up the note. The scientist will tell you exactly how much one note differs from another by the number of vibrations. The musician does not bother himself

about the vibrations; he knows by his own trained ear whether a note is true or not, whether it is sharp or flat compared with another. If it is the least out of perfect accord, he recognises it by hearing. He does not have to reason it out. He hears a discord, and he also knows if it is in perfect accord. The more perfect his ear, the more overtones he hears. That is the quality that you have in the Intellect. It *is* knowledge: that is its nature. If an external impact is in any way inaccurate, the false note is known by the Intellect. If the external thing is true, accurate, then it will be in perfect accord with the Intellect and will be recognised as true. That kind of simile may help you to the realisation of what is really meant. The nature of the Intellect is jarred by what is not true; and, according as the body of the I is perfected in organisation, so does his own nature come out through the veil of that causal body in which he is clothed.

When you come to deal with the Gnostics of the early Christian Church, you will find in them, if you have the patience to worry out what is meant by very obscure wording, some wonderful philosophical rays of Truth coming out, and indicating to an extraordinary extent the union between the higher vision exercised by the Intellect, and the vision that is reached by development of the higher senses. I mentioned Plotinus, and he and some others, like Valentinus, will give you what you need. Valentinus

failed to explain what he tried to explain, because he saw by a high development of clairvoyance and brought the observations down to the physical plane. That is neither the mystical nor the intellectual way of doing it. It was by the development of the bodies that he was seeing to a very, very high point. It was not gained by reasoning, nor by sinking into himself and finding the very centre of Life. He was concerned with the unfolding of Life in forms, and saw the higher worlds of being, the earlier stages of the creation of a system.

You will find Mr. Mead's works on the Gnostic writers very valuable for your study. It wants patience, because it is very obscure. It is a curious mixture, imaging by a kind of mathematical arrangement by the Intellect phases which are not normally known.

You will also find the more orthodox Christian philosophies distinctly valuable. The Gnostics were regarded as heretics, and were turned out. You will find the Philosophy of the Schoolmen worth studying, if you have the metaphysical Intellect. In all these you must try to see from the standpoint of the writer and thinker, not from your own. If you come to the puzzle: "How many angels can dance on the point of a needle?" it does not seem to be a very useful subject. Yet you will find some of the subtlest reasoning about it, which has meaning for those who are in tune with it, and it will lead you to

the understanding of certain other subtle things in Religion, which otherwise are incomprehensible, such as the real meaning of Transubstantiation.

The Doctors of the Middle Ages are very well worth studying, both Christian and Mussalmān, and in the latter you will find the Vedānṭic Aḍvaiṭa very finely and acutely put. In these, where pure metaphysical reasoning is concerned, you will find much illumination. As I said, there is nothing else so akin to the Aḍvaiṭa Vedānṭa as these, but the difficulty is to get at them. They are written in Arabic. They were translated into the dog-Latin of the Middle Ages, and are only very partially translated into any modern European language. One knows them only in fragments. The French and Germans have translated bits of them, and my own very scanty knowledge of them depends on those fragments; yet I have found nothing more subtle than the working of the Arabian intellect, founded on the Neo-Platonic Schools of Græco-Egypt. The study will enable you to bridge over the gulf between Hinḍūism and Islām. Unfortunately very few of the modern Mussalmāns seem to care to translate these for our benefit, well worth studying as they are. I had the British Museum searched when I wanted to study them, but found only some translations into monkish Latin. Very little of them is found in English.

Side by side with this you will take the great philosophy of Buḍḍhism, one of the most subtle in

the world. I am not sure how far the Zoroastrians have recovered their philosophy, but there is one thing which is common between the Philosophy of Zoroastrianism and that of Hinḍūism, and that is the pantheistic and polytheistic elements. I hardly know whether it belongs to Philosophy or Religion. We must call Spinoza a philosopher, but his form of Pantheism cannot be said to be religious. It is pure Philosophy. On the other hand you may take the extension of that in Zoroastrianism and Hinḍūism in what is called polytheism; it is the making intelligible of the mechanism of the universe through Beings who are the manifestation of Īshvara in limited forms —the Angels and Archangels of the Islāmic and Christian Religions, and the Ḍevas of the Hinḍū and Buddhist. Where that illuminates Pantheism, you have Religion in its most perfect form. It appeals to all stages of intelligence, and not only, as Philosophy does, to the higher Reason and the Intellect of man.

You will certainly study the Greek Philosophy and find how closely it approximates to Hinḍūism. Pythagoras was initiated in Egypt, but He came over to India and found some of His philosophy there. I hope you will also find a place in your studies for the Neo-Pythagorean philosophy, which was taken up by Giordano Bruno of Italy, and carried on by him until it brought him to the stake. He has in that the highest Ideal of Deity, and at the same time has a scientific view. It is an interesting combination of

Philosophy and Science, at a time when the pursuit of both, or of either, was very dangerous.

You have an enormous range of study before you. When you finish the six months' course, you will be very much more hungry for knowledge than when you began it. Your mind will be better furnished, and you will desire to go on studying.

LITERATURE AND ART:

OR

GOD MANIFESTING AS BEAUTY

THE subject that we have to study this morning is one which is enormously wide. Naturally you may say that Literature divides itself into many branches —the branches which you will study day by day in the courses which lie before you. Everywhere we find a form of Literature belonging to Mysticism, another belonging to Religion, a third belonging to Philosophy, a fourth belonging to Science, and so on. The whole of these clearly could not be included in one course of lectures, but will come naturally under their own divisions. You will be studying the mystical literature obviously in connection with the study of Mysticism, because there is not only the experience of the Mystic, but the record of that experience as embodied along a very definite line of Literature. In religions we find those marvellous Scriptures belonging to each, which stand out from everything else in the way of the written teaching of mankind. There you have a group of books that seem to stand alone, coming obviously from what are sometimes called God-illuminated men.

To them all the religions look up. These make on them commentaries, and take from them texts, and use them in the teaching of their own religion. They are the standards and remain; they are apart from all the other literature that may be developed in connection with each separate religion. So, when you deal with Philosophy, you have a great department of Literature there especially dealing with philosophy and metaphysics, the work of the higher mind, just as in the other two cases you have the seeking of the realisation of the Self, and the Buddhic illumination of the intellect giving the religious literature. Then, again, when you go into the consideration of Science, you find a very special Literature belonging to that. Dealing with our last point, Social Evolution, there again you have a number of great books written by the giants of our race long before their time; and then a number of modern books dealing with the problems of our own times, brought about by a special form of civilisation.

What then is it that is specially intended for our line of study? What is included under this name of Literature with the addition of Art? I should say that it includes all that tends distinctly to the Culture of man as distinguished from his Education. Education more implies first the drawing out of the faculties of the pupil, and then the supplying of such knowledge as is suited to those faculties, and by that supplying the further development of the faculties themselves,

with the result that you have a man who possesses a large amount of learning along one line or another. The object of Education is to bring about the development of the natural faculties, and the evolution of a man who is competent to deal effectively with some special branch of knowledge. There is a well-known saying that an educated person should know one subject thoroughly, and should know something of every other subject. By such study you get, as Bacon said, "a full man"; a man full of knowledge, full of information, full of the power to give out that knowledge, and utilise it for the benefit of those around him.

When you come to Culture, you seem to come into an entirely different atmosphere. If one might use a simile drawn from operative masonry, you might say that in the one case all the rough material is brought for the building, stones hewn out roughly and prepared for their places; while you might say that culture is the polishing of the stones, the taking of the comparatively rough stone and changing it into the polished stone, which is fit to take its place in beautiful building. A cultured man is a man who is essentially polished in every respect. His mind is polished; is beautiful in appearance; has had all the rough excrescences chipped off it and the polish put on it. He is a man who can fit himself to any society, who can accommodate himself to the peculiarities of any individual; and in one sense, for the social

union that I am hoping to indicate to-morrow, Culture is even more important than Education. A cultured man is a man whose whole nature has undergone a certain refining process. His manners will be polished; his words will be well chosen, and suited to the particular subject with which he is dealing. If he is a speaker, he will not speak in the same way on a religious subject, an economic subject, a commercial subject. He will adapt himself to the subject, and use the style suitable to each. He is a man who is congruous in all his parts. They fit together well. They make a complete whole. You do not find in him any great gaps or deficiencies, any uncomfortable corners that run into other people. The cultured man is the ideal of a social unit. He is able not only to adapt himself, but also to make himself pleasant and acceptable to people of all types; and especially, when people speak of social equality, you have there a thing for which Culture is essential. You need to have in your schools not only Education definitely taken up on a subject, but that atmosphere, that moral as well as mental training which smoothing away defects of character, either in deficiency or in excess, makes a man able to associate pleasantly with a sense of giving and receiving, in connection with all the people whom he meets.

There is a phrase that I have sometimes used in dealing with the grades in society to-day, that all

reasonable people sharing similar opinions on the matter in hand, can *work* together, whatever their so-called social rank, but they cannot *play* together. The tastes of cultured and uncultured people are generally very different. The kind of humour, for instance, that amuses one is regarded by another as unpleasant. So you cannot have pleasant social intercourse unless you have in a Nation a certain definite amount of Culture through which all children pass, and catch its atmosphere—that refinement of mind, emotions and body which enables people to mix together without jarring.

I only suggest that to you as the difference between Education and Culture, because, as it is my own view, it largely governs the subject I want to put to you this morning. There is no particular kind of Literature that you would put aside as being purely cultural; but you will find parts of all Literature which have this peculiar effect on character. For instance, in Plato's *Republic* and More's *Utopia*, in books of that idealistic character, you have a very strong element of Culture. That which ought to be brought out in every man to make him a good citizen is essentially a cultural process. A certain habit of mind and emotion is necessary. Mind and emotion must both be controlled, both disciplined, and neither must be allowed to run into excess. This produces the very essence of what is called good manners—tolerance,

broad-mindedness, mutual respect. Owing to the ancient tradition in India, you find gentleness, kindness and courtesy practically universal among all ranks of people, except among those who have suddenly got a wrong idea of Liberty, and think it means the assertion of the personal self, and who for a time lose that grace and balance which, owing to the very ancient tradition of Culture in India, bring people of different types together without jarring, or finding any incompatibility with each other in what they are doing or enjoying.

I have used the word tradition; and there is a certain literature-tradition which essentially lends itself to that which I am defining as Culture. You cannot confine it to any one of the departments that I have mentioned. You will find it present wherever the language is very carefully chosen, where what we call "diction" is very good, where the emotion expressed through that diction is refined in its nature. It comes, of course, a very great deal into poetry, because the limitations placed on poetry—or that used to be placed on it, I should perhaps say—are a certain discipline of the mind and the emotions. Poetry peculiarly lends itself to Culture, and a study of the great poets of the world will almost inevitably bring about a cultured man. He will be very many-sided. He will have lost the aggressive side of his own particular Nationality; he will be able to sympathise with the people of other Nations, with the

lines of thought and emotion which characterise any particular Nation. And that is one of the advantages which very many of us have thought of, although I know it is not very much thought of to-day, to which the older Universities of Europe specially lent themselves. The study of Greek and Roman literature has this cultural effect very largely. The study of the classics is a little bit out of popular favour at the moment, but it has an enormous value. The same is true in the East of the study of Samskṛṭ and Arabic, the two great classical languages, from which others are derived, in the East. I ought also to include Persian, a very beautiful language, particularly developed in its sounds and in its harmony.

I pause for a moment on the cultural value of poetry, for this reason, that I am afraid the doctrine is now a little heretical, and does not quite square with the modern idea of poetry. It seems to me that in poetry you need two things, a beautiful thought, and also melody and harmony in the rhythm of the language; and I find it very difficult to accept as poetry certain lines, beginning with capital letters, which do not have any rhythm or any apparent relation of harmony to each other. They do not seem to make a chord, but rather a number of strokes struck at random. That may be one of the prejudices which old people are apt to acquire with regard to new things. For all I can tell, the poetry which, from my standpoint, is not poetry, however fine in

dea, may become the special form in which the poetic Muse may hereafter choose to clothe herself. But some of the attempts that one sees in modern writings, where the thought is trivial and the rhythm is only remarkable by its absence, do not appeal to me as poetry which is likely to produce that equipoise and harmony, which should be the characteristic of the cultured man. I come across lines that only seem to be poetry by having capitals at the beginning of the lines. They may be something on the way to a greater thing, like cubist painting, that may be very fine, but my eye cannot see it. I dislike also the artificial languages that are occasionally invented for the benefit of mankind. It might be useful to have a common language which antedates the Tower of Babel, but not the modern ones, which are patched up like a quilt. But these may be prejudices, and it is not wise to insist that things in the world of the future shall shape themselves after the pattern that old people most admire. It is for you to decide what you mean by poetry. I mean a great thought, a noble thought, an inspiring thought—an idea that is fit to turn into an ideal—clothed in exquisite language. There may be many degrees of that, but where harmony is distinctly thrown aside, rejected rather contemptuously, my old-fashioned ear says it is not poetry. There are certain effects which may be made by a definite ruggedness of language, adopted for the purpose.

You may have ideas which are startling, catastrophic, you may have cataclysmic circumstances, and you may adapt your sound to the expression of the thought; and that, I think, is the very essence of poetry.

Now with regard to prose. All really fine prose has in it this element of rhythm, and it is a point that is, curiously, often ignored, especially by the younger writers—I do not mean well-known writers, but people who are beginning to write. They do not utilise the resources of the language in which they are writing. They repeat the same word over and over again, whereas in fine prose you find no repetitions of words which beat on the brain, as it were, by their repetition. You use synonyms, or pronouns, and you should certainly, I think, use the fineness of your ear in choosing, say, the number of syllables in which you end some sentence. That may seem to you artificial, but thought goes very much faster than words. One of the great defects of spoken prose—that which ought to be either a lucid statement of certain facts, beautiful by its lucidity, or which should be oratorical—one of the great defects which you notice in so many public speakers is that they finish anyhow, without coming down to the ground gracefully. They end abruptly, like an unresolved chord in music, and you feel you are left in the air. In any prose or poetry

which is intended to be spoken aloud or read aloud, you must regulate the music of your sentence. There are always three or four ways of finishing a sentence. If you want to be a speaker, these must come into your mind when you are reaching the end of your sentence, and you must choose the one which is most musical. It is really very easy. I remember once saying to H.P.B. in my early days: "I am not in the least clairvoyant." She said: "You are exceedingly clairvoyant." I did not like to contradict her, as she was a difficult person to contradict; besides, one preferred to think over a thing that she said, that did not strike one at first as very helpful; and so I quietly waited, and she said: "How do you finish up your sentence when you are speaking?" I said: "I see two or three different endings before my eyes, and I choose the one that seems most musical." She said: "That is clairvoyance—to see a thing that is not physically visible; to be able to look at and choose among a number of things that you thus see, is a form of clairvoyance." What one sees is a form which does not belong to the physical body, but to the mental body. Your mental body sees it and sends it down to the physical brain. As a fairly old speaker, I recommend to the younger ones among you that you should deliberately choose the form of words, when you finish up your sentence, which produces a musical, harmonious

effect upon the people whom you are addressing. Thought goes faster than words, and it is quite easy to think of a thing a good minute ahead of your saying it. It is absolutely necessary, if you are trying to be a really fine speaker. To my mind the same is necessary in great writing, because, after all, you hear the read sentence almost as much as you do the spoken sentence. It always makes a certain effect upon your sense of sound, and is either pleasant or unpleasant, according as that sense of sound is satisfied or is not satisfied.

Then you come to the consideration whether it is possible to assign works of Literature to the various divisions of the mind and emotions of man, and whether there is a style which in one case makes it Literature, *i.e.*, which is permanent, and, if absent, makes it mere writing that will rapidly die. Looking at writing from that standpoint, it is quite clear that you can allocate certain Literature to certain definite lines of the courses you are to study here. I need not trouble you about this, but everything that we should call Literature in the technical sense of the term—without stating the subject with which it is dealing—must be an expression of beauty in some form. I put at the end of that little summary that I gave in yesterday's *New India* that the various subjects are really manifestations of God in certain ways, and it seems to me that that

which characterises Literature is that it is a manifestation of God as Beauty.

This is true, of course, supremely of Art. But after all, you may as much have artists in words, as artists in stone, or colour. All great Literature has that characteristic of Art. It is well for every one who desires to be a creator—and every writer is a creator to some extent—to remember that it is his duty to be a channel for the manifestation of God as Beauty. It is that which makes Greece so wonderful in the Literature of the world, simply as Literature. The language in itself is beautiful in sound. It lends itself to beautiful writing. But in order that it may be a channel of Beauty in the true sense of the word, it must also be exceedingly accurate, must exactly express the thought, must give the reader the idea which is in the mind of the writer.

There is nothing more wonderful in the manifestations of God in Nature than the fact that they are all beautiful, and the more closely you examine into them the more marked does that beauty appear. It sometimes seems that the one work of Nature in modern days is to re-make into beauty the natural beauty which man has destroyed in very many of his proceedings. Take one of the most beautiful districts in England, as an example of what I mean. In going through some of the Midland counties you get a very beautiful kind of almost

garden landscape; hills not too high; curves always, not sharp crags, or edges, or points. The whole of the country is a little more than undulating, but the style of the ups and downs is really undulating like waves. There are a great many trees, and hedges and flowers. Going through it in the train you come across a little bit of it now and again. A large part of that country, unfortunately for itself, had iron and coal in it, with the result that men began to mine it, and in mining they did not think of the beauty; they destroyed it. They flung out the stuff they did not want in great black heaps, as ugly as they could be, at the top of the pits; so that the landscape was disfigured and rendered repellent instead of attractive. As time goes on, Nature turns these heaps of shale into little hills, and makes curves on them. Birds drop seeds on them, and gradually plants begin to grow, and you get a coating of verdure; tiny shrubs grow into trees; and so the ugliness created by man is changed into the beauty that is Nature's natural expression. One reason for that is that Nature works absolutely by Law. She is the perfection of discipline and self-restraint, and however far you go, and however minutely you examine Nature, you still find that God cannot manifest Himself outwardly in form except by beauty. He cannot manifest without the manifestation being beautiful. Any one who studies with a microscope knows it. He knows that tiny creatures, invisible to the naked eye, are full of

beauty. Their forms are graceful. Very tiny creatures, like the wonderful diatoms, have geometrical patterns exquisitely engraved on them, which cannot be seen by the naked eye.

Gradually, as you find that everything in Nature has a beauty of its own, you realise that the life which is behind every form is a Life of Will and Wisdom, of which Beauty is the inevitable expression; and then you will naturally try to adapt yourself to that, that your work also shall have this element of beauty. Accuracy is necessary. Looseness of expression can never be beautiful; and it is, I think, because that was the great characteristic of the Keltic sub-race, of which the Greek was one of the early expressions, the beauty which you still find in all the branches of that sub-race, that the Latin races of Europe, the Italians, Spaniards, French, the Highlanders of Scotland, the Kelts of Ireland, always endeavour to shape their ideas into beauty; the yearning after the beautiful, the hunger for it.

France is a very good expression of that in Literature. There is extreme perfection in her Literature from the artistic standpoint. Words exactly match the ideas, so that you cannot help knowing what the writer means. The same word is not used for two ideas, nor is one idea expressed in two or three words. There is a phrase: "That which is not clear is not French." If you contrast that with German, you will see the

difference. Very often in German you have to read a very long sentence twice over, because there are so many parentheses in it, so many ejaculations thrown into it, and then the rather curious way of having the verb at the end. I have known a German sentence lasting over two octave pages of print. That sort of thing is parodied by Mark Twain. You will get enormously strong thought in German, magnificent thought, but the expression is often aggravating beyond description, and you may almost say that the peculiarity in the language is shown out largely by the people. Probably it is truer to say that the peculiarity of the Teutonic type creates the structure of that language. It is the very opposite of Samskṛṭ, the "perfectly-constructed" language.

When you come to Art, have you not there the very highest form of what may be really called Literature? Does not the perfect Art speak to you in the most definite, lucid and exquisite language? Here in India you have to recognise Art in the life and in the features of the religious art which do not attract the stranger. The reason for this is quite definite. The shape given to a Hindū Ḍeva or Ḍevī is not intended to be judged by the canon of human beauty, but by its fulness of symbolism of the verities of the unseen world. It is an attempt to put into a clear symbol a power which exists in the unseen world embodied in that particular form. Thus you get results which, from the modern artistic standpoint,

are grotesque, but full of meaning from the ancient Indian standpoint. You cannot judge them in the ordinary way by the canons of modern art in Europe, formed on the Greek model. But there is one thing common to Greece and India in the way of Art, on which for a moment I would like to lay stress; and that is, that the life of the people, the things used by the people, the common household utensils, the surroundings of the ordinary life have all these elements of beauty, and therefore of Culture, in them. Take Greece, and you will find that all the household instruments are beautifully shaped. You find that the dress is draped into very beautiful lines. You find that everything that surrounded the people in their cities, the most splendid works of their artists, were made common property by being put in the open streets, by being used in public buildings, so that the life of the people as a community, as well as at home, might be continually under the influence of beauty. The result of that was a beautiful Nation, the men and the women reproducing in themselves the beauty which continually surrounded them outside. That you find in India also. The ordinary pots and pans in a peasant's house will not jar on your sense of beauty. Many of them are made on the potter's wheel, which cannot help making a beautiful shape. There are many beautiful metal vessels. Happily my great enemy in India, the kerosine tin, is very rapidly disappearing. I have carried on a very bitter

crusade against it ever since I first landed in India. You will not see in the compound of the Theosophical Society a number of women carrying water in kerosine tins, instead of in the old beautiful brass or earthen pots. The kerosine tin degrades taste, and destroys the sense of beauty. Similarly the clothing of the Indian is beautiful in its form, adapted to the climate, and graceful in its folds. That is fortunately coming back again very largely. There was a time in Calcutta when a whole audience of Indians was dressed in exceedingly badly cut European clothes. Happily the old trouble about the partition of Bengal reacted on the clothes of the people; they refused to wear English clothes and took back the dhoti and shawl.

Outer beauty is important for the beauty of the form. The expectant mother must be surrounded with beauty. The beauty reacts on the unborn child. This has been too much forgotten, but now it is coming back. The plastic body of the unborn child is very largely moulded by impressions from outside. Harmony of emotion, of thought, of beauty, on the part of the mother, is one of the great elements in shaping into beauty the child that is unborn. If you will give Nature a chance, she will make everything beautiful, and I should like this fifth line of study to be thought of by you as a study by which you may learn to be the channels of God, manifesting as Beauty.

SCIENCE:

OR

GOD MANIFESTING AS KNOWLEDGE

OUR subject this morning is that of God manifesting as knowledge. The word knowledge is here used for the observation of the external universe. But there is a profound difference between the Science of the East and of the West, and I think you will have to keep that in mind during the whole course of your study. One begins from the pole of Spirit; the other begins from the pole of matter; so that one, as it were, comes downwards, and the other climbs upwards; one starts from Purusha, the other climbs up from Prakṛṭi. In that there is a profound difference of method, but none the less they will ultimately meet; and it is interesting to notice in modern Science how very much, at the present time, that Science is climbing up, away from the physical. It is, in fact, compelled to do; it cannot help itself, because we find that, having more or less mastered the phenomena connected with the solid, the liquid and the gaseous, it then had to pass on into forms of matter which, being intangible to the senses, cannot be observed in

the way which is the basis of what we call modern western Science. Hence, Science has been compelled, as it were, to lose touch to a certain extent with what it has recognised as material phenomena, and it has had to resort to the non-material science of mathematics, in order no longer to try to understand motion by the study of the phenomena of matter, but rather to try to understand matter by the phenomena of motion, which it is compelled to observe.

Now that is an enormous difference as regards western Science. It marks a step from which it passes from the direct observation of the senses, or from arguments derived from these observations, or by the use of apparatus by which the observation of the senses may be extended—through the microscope, or the spectroscope, or whatever it may happen to use. But you still are in region of an indirect observation of phenomena.

Now Science in the West finds itself in this peculiar position. Either it must adopt the eastern method of developing other sense-organs, through which the sense-centres in the more subtle body may act, to observe these phenomena, still of the physical plane, although our eyes are not as yet, as a rule, sufficiently developed to observe them; or it must resort to the help of Mathematics, which essentially is of the region of the Higher Intellect, and is very closely allied to Philosophy, belonging as it does to the same stage of consciousness.

You have, looking at the eastern method, to transport yourself into an entirely different sphere: you have to realise that the great scientists of the earlier world were Sages in the fullest sense of the word, who had developed senses and sense-organs of observation, which only work through the subtler matter of higher worlds; that they were what we in India call Ṛshis; that they were men who had passed through the great Portal of Liberation into super-human evolution; and that they had therefore exercised the full possibilities of humanity in the higher bodies as well as in the lower. Hence they observed what are really noumena—happenings in the higher worlds—first; and they worked down from those to the physical plane; whereas western Science is working upwards from the physical, reaching the subtle physical ethers of the physical plane, and is beginning to observe in a very definite fashion the phenomena of the next subtler world called the astral, or intermediate world, intermediate as between the physical world and the heaven world, that which is, as regards its matter, the world of the emotions. In that there is a great difference in the observer of which, for a moment, I must remind you. Where you have the ancient eastern teaching, you have men in the superhuman stage of development, men who, through a long course of evolution, had been able to reach the perfection of the phases of consciousness which we have connected with our

physical, astral and mental bodies, and also to pass onwards into the Buḍḍhic and Āṭmic worlds, the higher planes from which the whole of the fivefold universe is contemplated. You know that in the Upanishaṭs you have constantly the term "the five-fold universe"; and it has given rise to a great deal of useless discussion as to differences between the Upanishaṭs and *The Secret Doctrine* of Madame Blavatsky. She lays stress on the "sevenfold universe," which is only rarely, though occasionally, mentioned in the Upanishaṭs. We hear of Prāṇa, sevenfold, dividing itself. We hear of the sevenfold fire. Now and then there is a suggestion of the seven-fold universe. But for the practical purposes for which the Upanishaṭs were given, you must remember that a large part of those came down before the Āryan Race to the Fourth Root Race, and that you find traces of them in the thoughts of the most highly philosophical Nations of that race; remembering that, you will understand why there was not very much said of the sevenfold constitution. It was not possible for the men of that time—even the wise men for whom some of the Upanishaṭs were first intended were not yet superhuman—to investigate those highest regions directly. Hence they were practically left out of account. For very much the same reason, knowing that His religion was chiefly to spread among certain Nations of Asia, the Lord Buḍḍha largely left out any reference to Ishvara, not to the Ḍevas who

are His servants, but to Īshvara Himself. The Lord Buḍḍha based His morality on a ground which could be taken up by the generations coming after Him, who had not such development of metaphysical faculties as were needed for the subtler metaphysic and philosophy. In the translation of His works into Chinese, where keener intellects were to be found, you have the reference to those unattainable regions on which He thought that everything that was attainable depended. We noted yesterday that, in speaking of Nirvāṇa, He said that, because of the invisible, the uncreated, because of those, the created or the visible could exist. But He would not go beyond the statement that "Nirvāṇa is". He did not try to bring down that which cannot be spoken in human language, because He knew that by so doing he could thus only distort it.

Now under these conditions, in studying Science, as it is known to us now historically, through the many books both in the eastern world and the western, you find this fundamental difference between them; and the interesting point is that you are obliged to trace it in the western, when eastern Science begins to give birth to that modern Science which was necessary for the development of the concrete mind of man. It is very interesting to observe the Mussalmāns knitting on their thought to the Neo-Platonic schools of Græco-Egypt, and that knowledge, being spread in Arabia, was carried by them to Europe, and brought

about what we can call the Renaissance of Europe so far as Science was concerned. You have to remember that Mathematics practically came to us through Islām in Europe, and it was not welcomed by the European world. When Pope Sylvester II, in his mathematical studies, was unwise enough to use a pair of compasses, he was accused of commerce with the devil. No man was supposed to make such signs unless he was trying to raise the devil. They had no idea of the physical use of the compasses. I mention this to show you the kind of darkness into which the new Science came, Science in the expression of which we owe an enormous debt to Islām, just as it brought, as we saw yesterday, the art of architecture to India in a new form. To that Islāmic architecture, Europe owes the wonderful buildings in Southern Spain, such as the Alhambra, that were built by the Moors. The Mussalmāns brought with them the whole mass of Science which had been gathered up in the great University of Bagdad, under the impact of the teaching given there by Ali, the son-in-law of the great Prophet of Arabia. One of the finest descriptions of Science may be found in the sayings of the Prophet Muhammad. He describes it in a way which shows the intense enthusiasm which it arouses, where the intellect is highly developed and knowledge is loved for its own sake.

The result of that is that when you go to Egypt and try to gather from the fragments dug up from

the Egyptian tombs something of what is called the Wisdom of Egypt, you find that it runs along lines which, until the last few years, were regarded as superstition in the West. That which was itself a superstition has been swept away by our increasing knowledge, due to modern investigations. Science was then called, in its higher phases, "The Great Work," and from that the Magus, the knower and the doer of that Great Work, took his name. From that again comes "Magic," which really only means the Great Work—the Great Knowledge, which is the Great Work; and the various things that were done by the ancient Egyptians were naturally ragarded as magical, and in a very real sense were magical, as worked by the Egyptian priests and the other Egyptian wise men. There was no divorce with them between Religion, Philosophy and Science. They were all looked upon as divine manifestations, each in its own particular place; and while Science belonged to the material side of the world, it was in no way confined to the physical side of the world. It recognised the phenomena of the subtler material worlds as well as those of the denser.

It is a remarkable thing to notice in Egypt that the highest Priest was also the highest Ruler; that the Pharoah was the great repository of occult knowledge; and you get a curious indication of that in the Hebrew Book of Exodus, where the Jews, who had to be delivered from the ruler of Egypt, were driven

away from that country. You find Moses and the priests of Egypt playing off magical tricks one against the other; one throwing a rod upon the ground and making it appear as a serpent—one of the tricks of the lower magic. H.P.B. did this trick for fun one day and made Colonel Olcott see a serpent. It is a very commonplace thing now. You can see it worked by men of western Science to any extent in some of the hospitals, especially in France, where they play a good many of these tricks and make people see what they wish them to see. It is done by mesmerism or hypnotism—one of the things which is gradually forcing western Science out of its insistence on the mistake that all phenomena must be accompanied by the physical matter with which they are acquainted.

The ancient name of Egypt is Khem, which has given rise to the name Chemistry, because of the wonderful knowledge of Egypt regarding the structure of the world. They began with the finest things in the structure of the world and worked downward. Hence the first thing they were concerned with, as in the case of the Hindū Scriptures, was space and the ether of space. The word Prāṇa, breath, as used in the Upanishaṭs is literally the breathing of the Divine Creator, whereby, it is said, that Creative Power brought all matter into existence. Matter is gradually built up, stage by stage, from the finest to the densest, by the seven successive stages of ever increasing

density (I ought to say 49 sub-stages). The method is aggregation. The very finest bubbles are the root matter, the Mūla-Prakṛti of our world. You can make bubbles yourself by blowing into water. But your bubbles are not permanent. As long as they stay below the surface of the water they are a symbol of the method of creation; but the bubbles float up and as soon as they get to the surface, the film of surrounding water breaks and the air is restored to the surrounding atmosphere. But if you take a straw and blow through it you get there a bubble in the sense in which the word is used. You should be on the look-out for that in your researches into the more ancient forms of Science, whether they be Hindū, Greek, or Egyptian. You have there what is the real bubble, a little space surrounded by slightly compressed Ether, made by the Breath of the Word, the Logos, who blows that material out of a minute space and occupies it with the breath of His Life. Untroubled water in a glass is like the unruffled ether; the bubble you blow in the water has not a film of water round it as it rises towards the surface of the water; the breath comes upwards by pushing the water aside; when it reaches the surface it raises a little film of water round the space filled with your breath, and floats in the air. Uncounted myriads of such bubbles are caused by the Divine Breath, and they are basis of matter. Those bubbles begin to aggregate together, and they go on aggregating into

seven sub-planes in each of the great planes of the Universe. When you come down to the denser matter here, you finally come to what modern Science used to recognise as the atom, the invisible particle. They made the blunder of putting the solid particles inside and the space outside. Instead of that, Science is now beginning to recognise that an atom is a swirl in the ether, which is surrounded by ether, but the outer swirl is so enormously resistent, that Science is now struggling to find out how to break it, set free and control the force that held it. Luckily it cannot find that out yet, though very near it. One of the great efforts of the Higher Powers is directed to checking western Science along this particular line of discovery. The reason is a moral and humanitarian one, qualities for which western Science has no place. If the scientists find out how practically to break up an atom, as theoretically they are able to do, the effect will be the letting loose of forces of such tremendous potency, that were they mastered by a scientist he would be able to lay waste a great city, to shatter it into dust —so tremendous is the force which holds the atom as one.

The atom used to be the unit of Science in the West. The books that I read when I was young told us that a carbon atom is always a carbon atom, and never could be anything else: atoms were uncreatable and indestructible. We now know

that the physical atom is a composite body. All the researches are leading modern Science very much out of its dependence on the solid, the liquid and the gas. The scientists are compelled to recognise radiant matter, discovered by Sir William Crookes, and out of that have grown all kinds of investigations which deal with the inner structure of the atom which formerly would have been the most horrible heresy.

It will be interesting to trace out among the Greek philosophers the theory of the atom, how they dealt with the elements (not the chemical elements); you will find in those speculations and investigations much that will throw light on the internal structure of matter.

Looking at it on eastern lines we see these aggregations gradually taking place among these impalpable bubbles until the five planes of atomic nature are formed, very subtle in the higher and becoming denser and denser as they come down. We have ultimately seven sub-planes in each plane. Just now we have solid, liquid, gas, radiant matter, and three more stages roughly called ether. It is the last and final stage of ether which is composed of the ultimate physical atom—not the chemical atom, such as the atom of Hydrogen, of which there must be two together, in order to be stable.

Thinking thus of coming downwards and climbing upwards, we have, before Chemistry, what we call Alchemy. Among the Egyptians Alchemy was the

foundation of Chemistry; coming downwards and downwards to the physical plane, they found the ultimate physical atom that of the highest sub-plane of ether. Then they found some very simple combinations of this on the second sub-plane. Those simple combinations were again aggregated into more complicated ones on the third; then into much more complicated on the fourth, until when they came to the fifth, to the air, they dealt with the gaseous conditions of matter, which may be denser or finer, heavier or lighter, and so on, down to the liquid and the solid.

It is interesting to notice the two great primary forces of the Universe, attraction and repulsion. First attraction is triumphant; then there is a struggle between the two forces; when you reach the gas, repulsion has the dominance. The gas will expand and expand until it gets more and more rarefied. On the other hand you can use means, bring in other forces like tremendous pressure and great cold, and you can force your gaseous atoms to become liquid. Many of you, perhaps, remember the first liquefaction of certain gases, which was looked on as an enormous advance in Science. Later, you get the solidification of gases, you get carbonic acid gas in the state of a solid, looking like snow. All these changes which modern Science has carried out have naturally made the scientist look at the whole question of matter from a different standpoint, so that the suggestion of H.P.B.

in *The Secret Doctrine*, that the atom is a swirl in the Ether, which was ridiculed when it was made in 1888 as showing what an ignorant old woman she was, is now accepted. The atom is looked on as an arrangement of various electrical forces.

So there is thus great progress being made; and when Science came to Europe after many centuries of obscuration, you find that those who were the founders of modern Chemistry did not teach modern Chemistry, but Alchemy. One of the things that was very much talked of was the production of gold from baser metals. Everybody wanted gold; and kings tried to get hold of the alchemist, and by threat and torture to compel him to reveal his method of transmutation of the baser metals into gold. I think Sir William Crookes was the first in quite modern scientific days to recognise the theoretical probability of Alchemy; and, as far as I know, it is generally recognised now that it is possible to dissociate and then to re-combine factors which are ultra-atomic, so that, when they come into the chemical elements, they will have been started along another line producing a different element. The researches in radium throw a great deal of light on this problem, and possibly before very long we shall have people making gold. I do not know whether that is so much an advantage. It used to be known only to the very wise, and they kept it secret. Probably modern scientists will publish it everywhere. However it will not do much harm.

The struggle of scientists now is to make Science National, so that each Nation may have the most deadly weapons of destruction—a truly "civilised" way of turning Science into a devil. It is a most horrible development of modern Science, absolutely against the idea of morality or brotherhood; and it would be well if some of the modern Nations understood—though they probably would not believe it—that it was just that mis-use of Science which brought about the tremendous cataclysm of Atlantis, where Science was used along the lines that led downwards to the depths of ruin, instead of upwards to the knowledge of the Supreme. It became one of the forces retarding evolution instead of quickening it, and when that goes too far, it has to be broken up and thrown away. It is the only fashion in which the Great Hierarchy can save the world and carry on the evolution of humanity.

Humanity has to evolve not only intellectually but morally. The conscience of man must develop, as well as his concrete mind. Otherwise the tendency is towards individualism, towards struggle, and combat of man against man; if that should triumph in Science, it will mean the destruction of the Teutonic civilisation; as the great civilisations of the Kelt, the Persian and the Egyptian have perished, and only survive in their literature and their tombs.

We trust, however, that such a catastrophe may be avoided, and that the knowledge of Science which

is useful and increases human happiness may be the outcome of the present achievements. In order that that may be so, the older evolution of Science in the East ought to be brought to bear on the conscience of Europe. There is one striking example of a modern scientist, Sir Jagadish Chandra Bose, and I mention him as a model of what a scientist ought to be, who wants to benefit and help the world. That is the great ideal of the East, that all knowledge is to help towards the happiness of the world, and to lead ultimately to Brahman, who is Bliss. You may remember how the final knowledge, the knowledge that we were studying on the first day, the knowledge of Him by whom all else is known, is referred to in the *Svetāshvataropanishat*, where it is said that until a man can roll up the ether like leather, there is no escape from misery, except by the knowledge of Brahman. When evolution turns aside from its goal, the bliss of Brahman, it has to be abruptly stopped, and turned into another line where men have to climb again up the ladder of knowledge. Sir Jagadish Chandra Bose has the old eastern idea of the discoveries of Science, that they are meant to benefit man and the whole world, and also the sub-human kingdoms; and that no discoverer has the right to keep his knowledge secret in order to patent it, in order to keep it for his own gain and advantage. That idea is not popular at present in the West, and a curious struggle arose. Bose was one of the very

first to discover wireless telegraphy. He showed it to some of us at the Calcutta University. I happened to be one of the first to see the results of some of his experiments on it, when he sent a wave of electricity without a wire from one side of the University through a series of rooms and walls to the other end. He made a chemical compound and fired off a pistol by an apparatus several rooms away, and showed us that it could be conducted by a medium other than wire. He worked out that discovery and went to Europe. Marconi had made a similar discovery, but he could not patent it, because Jagadish Chandra Bose also knew it; those who wished to exploit the discovery were afraid that Bose would publish the way in which it was done. They tried to buy him off. But he entirely declined to make any promise, or to do anything which would keep back the knowledge from the world; and he gave as his reason, that knowledge was a great spiritual light coming down from God, as was taught in the books of his own religion, and that no Hinḍū who believed in Hinḍūism could make a matter of gain out of the knowledge of God, which he had discovered through an investigation into nature. I only mention this to show that, from the Eastern standpoint, Science is really the knowledge of the external manifestation of God, and therefore is part of the Aparā Brahma Viḍyā, the lower Science of God. He manifests through matter, and that is really derived in the

highest sense from the Parā Viḍyā, "The knowledge of Him by whom all else is known". Hence a man, who believes in that Higher giving the knowledge of Himself through the various stages of matter, cannot treat it as a mere merchandise to be sold in the market for gain.

It is as that view of Science develops that Europe may redeem herself from the present fatal position into which she is slowly drifting. Once let Science again be the material side of Religion, once let the school of Science be again a part of every temple, as it was in the ancient days, then everything which is discovered, that conduces to human happiness, will be shed abroad to all who can appreciate it, while destructive discoveries, that might be used by the undeveloped for the injury of man, will remain in the safe custody of the Guardians of Humanity and Their servants, until mankind develops sufficiently to be fit to be trusted with that knowledge.

———

SOCIAL ORGANISATION:

OR

GOD MANIFESTING AS SOCIETY

THIS morning, in taking up the last subject that you will study, week by week, we have to think of the phrase, "God manifesting as Society". You will remember that Tennyson speaks of God fulfilling Himself in many ways, "lest one good custom should corrupt the world". As a matter of fact, all the good customs have finally grown corrupt under the manipulation of man, the ignorance of man, so that one after another has to be evolved, a stage towards the form in which humanity is fitting itself gradually to live, not like a number of wild animals in the jungle, but as an ordered society of rational beings. In this study you are very much helped by taking the wide outlook of the Divine Wisdom, and you may take it whichever way you find it the easier. You may take it as you have it sketched in some of the Purāṇas, those ancient books of Hinḍūism. Your difficulty will be to find your way through the metaphors and allegories to the facts which underlie them. You have to remember that the Purāṇas were very

largely given in order to educate, by means of allegories and stories, the poorer people who could not be appealed to along philosophical lines, or in the more intellectual regions of religion, to give them a sort of a general idea of the evolution of the world. One thing that you have to find out is where you are in them as far as history is concerned. You will find in them statements as to the seven Races by which humanity is being evolved on our globe. You will find also the fact that there are great seismic changes in the disposition of land and water on the surface of the globe, that accompany the evolution of these different fundamental Root Races. You are given the names of those continents right down (or up to) the seventh. You may then take it along that line, or you may use that line as a corroboration of the more occult side of the Ancient Wisdom and find it in many of our Theosophical books, because it forms the foundation of our view of human-kind and human society. The difficulty is in tracing the evolution of Society in what are called historical times, that is, when European Nations became sufficiently civilised to think of their past and future, a very very short space of time, a mere moment as compared with the Asian records. Those records kept in Asia and written down in Asia are not recognised as history, unfortunately, by the West, unless they can find something in their own limited experience to verify the ancient histories. That is one reason why

it is often said that myth is truer than history. Views which are looked on as mythical are found later on, as knowledge increases, to be a real guide to the longer evolution of mankind ; and it is well to get rid of that stupid idea which comes to us naturally from the younger Nations, because the younger peoples, as they acquire knowledge, generally grow more arrogant. The increase of knowledge gradually leads people to understand that there is much that they do not know and that it is larger than what they do know. Only then a reasonable attitude is taken up by the human mind. It is ready to learn, does not reject hastily, and does not consider that the very little it has acquired is to be regarded as the highest knowledge of the human being. Sir Isaac Newton said that he was like a child gathering a few pebbles on the shore of the great ocean of knowledge that stretched beyond.

When you look at history, there is one thing that will strike you. The European views of history have no beginnings ; in fact, to use a phrase of Bunsen about Egypt, "it springs full grown upon the stage of history like Pallas Athene from the head of *Zeus* ". That is true of all old civilisations. You cannot get a beginning for them. You find them stretching back and back, and showing some of their highest results in the very earliest days. That is pre-eminently true of the very ancient literature of Asia. You find its most wonderful literature right back in the very night

of the past; and it is one of the strongest arguments against the modern scientific view—which is, I am glad to say, dying out—that religions were evolved out of human ignorance, out of savages who deified the powers of nature, and that they were gradually refined and improved until they became quite respectably philosophical and ethical. I do not think there are very many thoughtful people who hold that view to-day. No one can hold it who has gained some insight into the past. It is quite obvious that all these great civilisations have in their Founders, in their early Rulers, men who were very much more highly evolved than those whom they ruled. It comes in allegorical form in the Hinḍū statement that men at first were all equal, and a King was formed—when they began to quarrel—out of the various parts contributed by a number of Ḍevas. What happened was that the great Ṛṣhis—who were very highly evolved beings who came to us from another planet, from Venus, and formed the nucleus of the great Hierarchy that was to be the Guardian of mankind—gave some of Their Members to be the Law-givers and some to be the Religion-givers of the infant humanity. And so you have, at the beginning of each great Root Race, these legends and myths as to Divine Kings. In Egypt we find it as the Divine Dynasties. You find it in ancient Peru, which is now beginning to be examined into by excavations, and is beginning to confirm some of the researches

that were made into that history by clairvoyant means. The Incas were looked on as the children of the Sun. You find the same idea in China that the great Rulers descend from the Sun, and it has gone across to Japan in the Mikado. You find in Hinḍūism the Divine Kings, pre-eminent being the great Avaṭāra, Shrī Rāmachanḍra. You have to go back behind Him in order to find the great Law-Giver and the Great Teacher of religion, Those whom I spoke of as coming down in pairs through the ages.

The general characteristics of these early civilisations we can easily sum up. They are all founded on the ideal of a human family. And comparing that with the way in which we can sometimes trace an evolution through a civilisation which conquered a less civilised one, you find traces of the kinds of settlements which formed. When Āryans came down through Baluchistan, the Hinḍu-Kush and Kashmir into India and settled there, they did not come into a country that was in any sense barbarous. They came into a country which already had had two great civilisations, the Kolarian, of which we do not know very much, and the Ḍravidian in South India especially. If you take them, you find certain differences, in detail, but there is one point which is common to all of them ; that is, what is called the village system, the village forming out of families and lasting down through millennia as a self-governing unit. It is quite possible to trace it in India, and outside India, by

the help of the researches which have been made into the settlements of the fifth sub-race, the Teutonic. We can consult the ancient records of England, Scotland, Scandinavia and especially perhaps of Germany, because German historians have been particularly careful and full—they are the highest examples of the scientific mind of the fifth sub-race of the Fifth Root Race that we can find in Europe. When these are put together and compared—as in the works of Sir Henry Maine—you find the village system which was brought from Asia and spread over the whole of northern Europe. I do not know how far it can be traced out in the southern parts, among the Latin races, but you certainly find it wherever the Teutons have spread.

In that village condition you have the natural and inevitable aggregation of families; and so you have the village government taking on the family type. There is very little left now of the old Kolarian civilisation. You will find it in some of the hill-tribes still. They make their villages much as they made them thousands of years ago. There is a tendency among them of isolation even of the families. Each family has a little hillock of its own, obviously for purpose of defence, and these aggregate together for purposes of more effective defence against more dangerous opponents.

Coming down to the Ḍravidian civilisation, you have there a large literature, that you can look into, and you will find there more of the hereditary principle than of the elective, which is worth noticing as a racial difference. The headman of the Ḍravidian village seems to have been the son of the last headman.

When you come to the Āryan, you find the elective principle in full swing, and the villages of the Āryans have all their headmen like their other officials elected year after year. You have a large literature on this subject existing now. You find a great deal about it in *Manu*. Other useful books are the *Arṭhashāsṭra* of Kauṭilya read side by side with *Shukraniṭi*, written one thousand years later. I say side by side, because you have the extraordinary stability of their village-civilisation. The instructions given in the fourth century before Christ in the *Arṭhashāsṭra* show a very very high stage of civilisation. Those given in the *Shukraniṭi*, in the seventh century after Christ, are equally high. You find the *Shukraniṭi* after all these centuries, and yet the directions as to the village building and organisation are so close to each other that you might take almost either book and use it by itself. There are certain points which are specially worthy of noticing. You find care was taken not only of the village organisation but also of the beauty of the village. You will find in each book instructions about the planting of flowering trees,

about the planting of flower gardens round each homestead. Every villager and his family had a homestead of their own. A homestead consisted of the house, vegetable yard, and a little piece of garden round it. As the villagers became more and more numerous the family share became divided. I cannot go into details, but it is a most wonderful study, the evolution of the Indian village, and its extraordinary stable character. The importance of that to you is this, that it is through these local organisations that, as society advances, it becomes more and more completely organised. You have, of course, in ancient India great empires which arose from time to time; and it is interesting to notice that in the reign of Chandra Gupṭa Maurya—in which the first book that I mentioned was written—how as the area increases, and you get an immense Empire (the empire of Chanḍra Gupṭa extended from the Hinḍu-Khush right down to the Narbaḍa river), the village organisation is reproduced in the larger area, so that, even when you come to the Imperial organisation, you still have the Village Council, the Pañchāyaṭ, each department of the State having a Pañchāyaṭ at the top of it, which corresponds now to the Secretariat. These Departments are very much the modern organisation under the British Rāj; the Departments, the Secretariat, and then the Ministers of the provinces, and so on, ultimately the Central

Government. You find the same thing in the reign of Asoka. He had four Viceroys and he was the head of them all.

The continual multiplication of the village is really a multiplication of the family life; so that you can see through the whole of this continuous history, which goes back as far as any history goes (not only that which is recognised in Europe, but also that which is recognised here), that it always goes back on the same model. The importance of this for us in the future is that the relationships of human beings are recognised as binding obligations. It is very often said nowadays (not always with the best of intentions) that the Indian is a law-abiding person by instinct. That is true, because the sense of obligation has survived, but it has been carried to excess, and that is why the opposite of that came over with the East India Company, in order that the excess might be corrected, servility on one side and tyranny on the other.

Looking at this enduring family type, when you are trying to look onwards, you will find that both Science and Religion point to the rebuilding of the family type on a higher level; to the reorganisation of society, not on the competitive system of the fifth Sub-Race in Europe, but on the family type as it existed in Asia. You can realise that in the successive manifestations of the Divine Wisdom, as shown in social organisation, you first have the family type,

in order to root deeply in the human mind the idea that human beings are closely related to each other, and are born into a system of mutual obligation. That, you may say, runs through all the ancient civilisations.

When, however, you come to the later civilisations of Europe, you there find, say in the Greek, the expansion of the village into the City State, which is so familiar in the writings of Aristotle. There at once you recognise one tremendous error, which is that it is only a minority who really form the citizens of the City State, while a large portion of the population are mere chattels, slaves. It is worth your while to read carefully Aristotle's defence of the principle of slavery; it runs through all Greek civilisation. You remember the arrogant phrase used by the Greeks which divided all beings into "Greeks and Barbarians". The Greeks knew very little of Asia and of the older civilisations there. Yet this civilisation of the city as a State is (if you can leave out the element of slavery) one of the finest in the intellectual conceptions of society that it is possible to find. It was the splendid Greek intellect—with the emotional side which made it worship beauty, and brought the arts to so high a point—that built up the wonderful fabric of the City State, and made the Athenian Citizen. I said it had one great error in its foundation on slavery. That is one of the backward sides of mankind that is not yet outgrown.

When you look at the modern Latin races, especially the Italians and Spaniards, you find the same cold indifference to the sufferings of the less developed human beings, and especially to those of the animal kingdom. The common excuse in Italy for cruelty to an animal, "It is not a Christian," condones any amount of cruelty to our lower brothers and sisters of the animal kingdom.

Looking at the best side of the City State, you find a very wonderful community of cultured men, every one of whom was held to be liable to exercise any duty of citizenship in the State. The other blot upon it was the entirely inferior position in which the Greeks put women. Women were not citizens. They were a kind of appanage to the men, and you find in that the chief explanation probably of the very inferior position that woman has held among the western Nations. I know that it is not accepted by everybody now, but any one who knows the history of legislation in Europe will realise that the woman was put quite apart from the man in questions of human dignity, of usefulness and of service, as well as in those of property. It is only in our own times, and largely due to the great injustice perpetrated on Shelley, and later on myself, in taking children from one or both parents because of their unbelief, that the right of married women to have control of their children was recognised by English Law. Only in the absence of marriage, was

control of children given to the mother. A married mother had absolutely no rights in relation to her child. That has now passed away under the force of public opinion stirred up by great injustice. Europe has been a great barrier to the evolution of women in matters of marriage, as also in the State and in all relations of public life. Marriage settlements were invented among the rich in order to prevent the confiscation of a woman's property when she entered the married state. The Christian ceremony put into the mouth of the man: "With all my worldly goods I thee endow"; but that ought to have been said by the bride, for all her property went over to him. The man endowed the woman with nothing. She gave over everything to him. Homes made by industrious working women could be seized and sold up by drunken husbands who had deserted them. This has been stopped by law, and a married woman's earnings are now her own. Of course, that partly came from the feudal system; but S. Paul is very largely responsible for the very inferior position assigned to women in the Christian religion, making the husband everything, and the wife nothing except a chattel.

It is interesting as a social matter to contrast that with both the Hindū Law and the Mussalmān Law. On the whole the Mussalmān Law with regard to the sexes is one of the most just that has been made, for it treats the women in these outward respects on a very fair footing; and

the law of Europe is more or less coming now into accord with the laws that have long existed in Asia. It is just as well to know these details, if you want to argue with people who hold that their civilisation is the highest. They are just coming up to the level of ancient civilisations. Among the Hebrews the law is very unfair and unjust. I do not know how it went in Japan and China. In Egypt and Assyria there was a good deal of equality.

Looking then at the family and the village, you have types of what we may call civilisations of mutual obligation. What entered into them in ancient India is a point that would be very much resented now, I am afraid. Every one would tell you that these civilisations were not democratic. It may be well to observe that in this evolution of civilisation, which goes in the direction of liberty, where you have small self-governing communities, very little interfered with by the larger self-governing communities containing them, you get a kind of liberty which is more stable than any other. It is too widely spread to be easily destroyed. The way in which the East India Company destroyed it here was by taking away the communal ownership of land in the village, and turning it into the ryotwari system, in which the man who cultivated the land was made its owner, or into a tenancy system. In all the older civilisations land was held by the village as a common property. It was recognised that the land of the country was

the possession of the people who were born into it, and ought not to belong to a class. If you take some very ancient Fourth Root Race civilisation, like that of Peru, you will find an admirable system prevailing as regards the land. It was divided into three great blocks. One block belonged to those who were the law-makers and the law administrators of the country, the Government of the day; then there was the block of land allocated to the religious, medical and teaching people; the third block belonged to the manual labourers. To each of these certain duties were attached, as later in the feudal system, that have been gradually thrown off. You have there, in exchange for the land, the whole burden of government thrown upon the King and the Nobles, and the obligations were most stringent and disadvantages were also placed upon them. With regard to what you may call the religious and teaching property, to that was joined the duty of free education in exchange for the land. They discharged all the religious obligations of the people, and they nursed the sick and maintained the aged. So that with that land belonging to these two classes, all these great duties fell upon them, and the wealth obtained from the land was used in this way for the benefit of the Nation; just as in the case of the other, it was used for the defence and the internal order of the Nation without any charge on the masses of the people. The masses of the people who cultivated the land were the first charge on the land. When there

was scarcity of water for irrigation purposes, the land of the people was the first to be irrigated, next came the land of the educators. The King and the Nobles had the last share. If crops were poor, the bulk of the crops would go to the cultivators because they raised them. The next in amount was to go to the middle class, the smallest to the highest class. In this way, in the ancient arrangements you have the ideal of the family carried out in a very remarkable way. In a family, supposing that food is short, it is the parents who take least of it; next come those who are able to work for the support of the family; the last are the children—they must have most, and physical advantages must always be given to them, because their life is the life of the next generation. The children must be the very last to suffer. That idea of mutual obligation and the balancing of duties and powers gave the extraordinary stability to this kind of civilisation in its great varieties; but it began gradually to decay where the highest class looked for privilege instead of duty; where the middle class shirked its duties of education, of nursing the sick and taking care of the aged, and threw that upon others, so that gradually the burdens of all fell upon the producers and reduced them to poverty, whereas they were the people who were first thought of in all the old civilisations, because they were regarded as the youngest and the most helpless. I want you to bear that in mind, because it is so

great a guide to the future which is lying in front of us.

In those days you cannot say that what we now call capital existed in the sense in which it exists to-day. Capital is the surplus of labour employed on land (raw materials). You must have land, the basis of production; labour, the producing power; capital, the surplus of that, which is to be used to feed labour while it is working, and while the crops are growing. The problem only arises where collected labour is rendered helpless by privately owned land and machinery, and the owners can prevent labour from working, except on the owners' terms. If the Russians had known more, and understood more, they would not have had the ridiculous plan of cutting up the big estates into small lots, and robbing the new owners of the surplus of their labour. Now they are running about Europe trying to get capital back in the old bad way.

Then you have the great change which comes with the development of the lower mind—the competitive system, and gradually then you have the throwing off of duty and the taking more and more of power and privilege. I remember reading in an old Chinese history that one province had great difficulty in finding a Governor. It was offered to many capable people; but they declined because they would not accept the responsibility. That was a serious thing in the ancient days. If there was a famine, the

Governor was responsible for bad government. If there was theft, robbery, dacoity, the Government was responsible, because it had not done its duty. The King's treasury had to restore fourfold the amount stolen from the man it had failed to protect. If the village watchman did not do his duty, and something was stolen, the watchman was held responsible for restoring it, unless it happened to be a movable thing, say a cow, which then had to be traced to the next village, and then the watchman of that village became responsible. You can realise that, under these conditions, to find a man to take the government of the province was not easy. The Governor would be held responsible for all the faults that the people committed. I think it was Confucius who, when asked by a King why there were robbers in his territory, answered: "If you, O King! did not steal, there would be no thieves in your kingdom." That was the old way of looking at things. The more a person knew, the more responsible he became. The faults of the ignorant and the poor were very lightly punished, while the faults of the educated, the learned, and the highly placed, were heavily punished. That is the right way of looking at things. The more a man knows, the more experience and power he has, the heavier should be the penalty if he abuses that power and deceives the people. I know, in the modern way, the more highly placed a man is, the better he should be treated in gaol; but that is an upside-down

way of dealing with things. Responsibility grows with knowledge and power; and that will have to return in the coming civilisation.

The coming civilisation will return at a higher level to the civilisation of the past. It will bring back co-operation and gradually eliminate competition. That is why in the Theosophical Society, which is supposed to be the fore-runner of that new civilisation, Brotherhood is the one thing on which great stress is laid. Brotherhood has to be brought back to human society. The next incarnation of the Divine Life, what is called the "spirit of the time," which is only God revealing Himself in Society, will press in that direction. Lessen your individualism: it has gone too far. Awaken your sense of obligation. The learned are responsible for the ignorance of the unlearned, the rich people for the misery of the poor, and the ruling people for the disorganisation of the State. We have once more to build the State as an organisation. The State ought to be the organised Nation, not its government. We rather speak of the State as though it were the Government. That is a fundamental blunder. The State is the whole Nation, organised on a definite plan for the increase of human happiness and the development of human capacity. At present, by competition, they have tried to get people into some sort of order; but they have only got anarchy. You cannot get order out of struggle like that. You have to bring out the

development of the child and his qualities. You might read Ruskin on this point of the reorganisation of the Nation. You have to realise that the fundamentals of wealth, the essentials of wealth, cannot be monopolised by individuals. Of course, that has become more strikingly evil with the growth of the great power of machinery, which has enabled one man or a group of men to monopolise the surplus results of the labour of thousands. The surplus result of one man may be small, but when you get thousands of men together the surplus is enormous, and yet the surplus over the wages paid goes either to a man or a group of men—a most irrational way of human society. You can see already, however, the beginnings of the substitution of co-operation for competition. Municipal ownership is substituted for private ownership in various undertakings that can be carried on better collectively. Presently your company will be a department of a municipality. Already it sometimes supplies water and light. You will see it developing rapidly. In England they have bath-houses, laundries, and all kinds of things in which human labour can be minimised, in order that there may be a larger equivalent to distribute among the whole of the people; and out of that municipal taxes are paid—obviously a better way of managing things than the individual producing, and the individual being taxed. Land ought not to be handed down from one owner to another, so that as the land

increases in value by the increase of population and industry, the gain goes into single families.

"That is Socialism!" Yes; it is the wise Socialism, not the foolish Socialism. The Socialism of our time is an uprising of the poor against the rich, driven desperate by conditions, and more and more infuriated by the sight of luxury around them. What else can you expect from the ignorant? They are constantly toiling, and seeing others enjoying who do not work. Inevitably that causes revolt.

When you compare the life-period in these Nations, you can see how unfavourable the comparison is. Take our life-period in India, which is 23·5 per cent years. Monstrous! How does it arise? From semi-starvation. Semi-starved mothers bear semi-starved children. They die in their infancy. Infant mortality in India is one of the most shocking things. The same is the case in the slums of London. There was a time when the deaths of children in London ran up to more than half of those that were born. New Zealand is better. The average life-period there is sixty years of life, because there is plenty of food, plenty of comfort. None are very rich, and none are very poor.

If Socialism comes by an uprising of the miserable, it is utterly destructive; but if the change in the coming civilisation is brought about by the sacrifice and thought of the instructed and the wise, then it will be the redemption of mankind. I cannot tell

you how far we shall go in that in the sixth sub-race, but we shall go a very considerable way. H. P. B. taught the "Socialism of love," where the learned try to share their learning with the unlearned, the rich try to share their comforts with the poor. You see traces of the beginnings of it in connection with some of the great employers of labour now in England, where they build garden cities for the people they employ, and give them back a large amount of wealth by all kinds of conveniences and enjoyments; where they build a club and a theatre free to the people they employ—giving back part of what they have taken from them. The truth is that the social conscience is beginning to awaken. That will go on more and more. It will come comparatively easily in India, because there is this spirit so much among the people. Take a joint family: you find that all the children are looked on as the children of any one of them. One of the things that struck me in India was that a friend of mine who belonged to a joint family looked on his brother's children just as he looked on his own children. That feeling made a brother take his brother's clothes if he wanted them —an easy thing where clothes are pieces of cloth and are washed every day. There is not the same sense of individual property here. It is the same with gardens. The Indian does not shut up his garden, unless he is westernised. People freely come into your garden and take their food under your trees.

Once an Indian, in reply to a question why people came freely into his garden, answered: "What else is a garden for?" We ought to be able to get that spirit more easily here. In the Sixth Root Race it will be the foundation of all decent human society, and so gradually you will have the Socialism of love and wisdom, which makes mutual obligation everywhere and does away with jealousy and envy.

Later, in the Seventh Root Race (that is a dangerous subject at the moment), you will get a condition where we shall need no laws; not the anarchy of the present but the order which comes from the development of the "Inner Ruler Immortal," in which every man is a law unto himself, because self-ruled from within. That is a very very long way off, but none the less it will come. That will finish the cycle of evolution on our globe; I sometimes think that Mr. Gandhi has got a glimpse of that, but very much out of focus, and so tries to bring about the condition without the appropriate people. External law is wanted so long as the Inner Ruler cannot govern His vehicles; but, gradually, external law will give place to internal law, and then no outer compulsion will be necessary, because man will do what is best, kindest, noblest, sublimest, moved by the Ruler from within.

Printed by A. K. Sitarama Shastri, at the Vasanta Press,
Adyar, Madras.

68